

of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

Paul C. Daniels, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.
J. Rives Childs, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

To be consuls general of the United States of America

Archie W. Childs
Ralph A. Boernstein

To be consuls of the United States of America

Hendrik van Oss Elmer Newton
Joseph A. Armenta William A. Withus
Seymour I. Nadler

To be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Charles K. Moffly
Alfonso Rodriguez

To be Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Francis J. Meehan

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Argyle R. Mackey, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Chauncey F. Tramutolo to be United States attorney for the northern district of California.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James M. Roche to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut.

John Wesley Thompson Falkner IV, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi. (Now serving under an appointment which expired April 10, 1951.)

Robert E. Boen to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Edwin H. McNutt, Hanceville.

GEORGIA

Edward H. Osborne, Avondale Estates.
William F. Gay, Gay.
William A. Enloe, Jr., LaFayette.

IDAHO

Joseph Vern Dunn, Montpelier.

ILLINOIS

Gerald C. Hardiek, Dieterich.
Francis M. Masterson, Fairbury.
Oliver W. Ator, Jr., Griggsville.
Nelle M. Antle, Hanna City.
Pearl L. Reilley, Hartford.
William G. Cabbage, Joy.
Carroll K. Heitzman, Litchfield.
Joy A. Mitchell, Noble.
Charles C. Paull, Roseville.
Jerry H. Elliston, Waltonville.

INDIANA

Richard L. Teeters, Martinsville.
Grat Millard, Montpelier.
Ralph H. Adams, Newport.
Gershon A. Adams, North Salem.

KENTUCKY

Mildred J. Golden, Bethany.

LOUISIANA

Jack W. Lemons, Abita Springs.
Ruth Maloof, Braithwaite.
Frederick J. Dugas, Paincourtville.
John I. Roberts, Venice.

MARYLAND

John O. Steel, Mount Airy.
Elwood F. Armacost, Upperco.

MINNESOTA

Albert E. Anderson, Montevideo.

MONTANA

William J. Brown, Dixon.

NEBRASKA

Grace G. Webb, Arcadia.
Laurence A. Carlson, Arnold.
James M. Casey, Johnson.
Leonard L. Gratopp, Shickley.

OHIO

Harry F. McLaughlin, Carrollton.
Warren D. Huffmyer, Cortland.
John Bennett Burford, Farmdale.
Charles R. Kline, Medway.
Howard R. Thompson, Piketon.
Donald P. Auxter, Seville.

OKLAHOMA

Lorraine S. Fogarty, Guthrie.
Homer Schneider, Hitchcock.
Francis B. Bordenkircher, Jennings.

OREGON

Harry E. Way, Aumsville.
Velma F. Evers, Elmira.
Chester L. Langslet, Klamath Falls.

PENNSYLVANIA

Paul C. Althouse, Parkesburg.
Joseph F. Sullivan, West Chester.
Henry F. Sickler, Jr., Westtown.
John Mark Good, Williamsport.

WASHINGTON

James S. Aynsley, Clallam Bay.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bob Henderson, Sistersville.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 18 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

POSTMASTER

Paul A. Hughes, Granville, N. Y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, the creator and source of life and light, we thank Thee for all the beautiful and marvelous revelations and changes which we are witnessing in the world of nature during this glorious spring season.

We pray that these changes may be inner as well as outer experiences, inspiring us to have our lives rooted and grounded in Thy divine life in order that we may grow in moral and spiritual stature, in beauty and strength of character, and in obedience to Thy divine laws.

May the mysteries and splendors of nature, upon which we are looking with wonder and amazement, challenge and stir us with a rebirth of spiritual desires and a renewed spirit of fidelity and devotion to life's loftiest aspirations and noblest principles.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord whom poets and prophets have called the Lily of the Valley, the Rose of Sharon, the Bright and Morning Star. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate had returned pursuant to House Resolution 195, the bill H. R. 3587, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 271. An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) entitled "An act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51-18.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement. After consultation with the majority and the minority leaders of the House and remembering the terrific jam we had upon this floor on previous occasions, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders, the Chair announces that on tomorrow during the ceremony the door immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right and none other. No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

No one will be allowed in the gallery who does not have a ticket.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him for tomorrow, and to address the House for 40 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

W. STUART SYMINGTON

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is to be commended for selecting W. Stuart Symington Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

W. Stuart Symington is an outstanding American. He is not only an intelligent, alert, able person, always working 100 percent in the public interest regardless of the capacity in public or private life in which he is serving. He is also a successful businessman. He has successfully organized, reorganized, built, established, and operated some of the finest and best business concerns in the United States. His ability as a businessman is unquestioned. He is not against big business as such and he is particularly a friend of small and independent business. In W. Stuart Symington, small-business men, wage earners, small farmers, and consumers generally have an official in one of the most important places in our Government—the head of the RFC—who understands their needs and aspirations.

It is my sincere hope that his confirmation in the other body will receive unanimous approval. I do not know of a man in the United States who is held in higher esteem and who has conducted himself before congressional committees with greater ability, more discretion, and with greater success in the public interest than W. Stuart Symington.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Abbitt	Engle	Passman
Allen, La.	Evins	Potter
Bailey	Gillette	Powell
Barden	Gwinn	Riehlman
Boykin	Hall	Rogers, Mass.
Brehm	Leonard W.	Sasser
Buchanan	Hand	Sieminski
Canfield	Hart	Staggers
Cannon	Hébert	Stigler
Carnahan	Kearney	Stockman
Celler	King	Taylor
Chatham	McKinnon	Towe
Cotton	Miller, Nebr.	Vall
Dawson	Miller, N. Y.	Velde
Dingell	Morrison	Wickersham
Donovan	Murdock	Wood, Idaho
Eaton	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff
Elston	O'Toole	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 3709, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read the first paragraph of the bill. If there are no amendments to the paragraph, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; for cooperation with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements relating to the employment of foreign agricultural workers, subject to the immigration laws and when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$4,635,500, of which \$743,500 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has recommended the reduction of the budget estimate for the Veterans' Employment Service from \$1,583,000 to \$743,500. I am in receipt of a letter from the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and the American Veterans of World War II, which I would like to read at this time, relative to this drastic cut. The letter is as follows:

To the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,

Member of Congress:

We, the undersigned, representing the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II, wish to strongly protest the report of the Department of Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, which recommends the reduction of the budget estimate for the Veterans' Employment Service from \$1,583,000 to \$743,500. The committee expressed its belief that one Federal veterans' representative and a clerk-stenographer for each State and Territory, together with a small headquarters staff, would be adequate. This action amounts to a cut of over 53 percent, and in money an amount of \$839,500. This constitutes a stag-

gering and crippling blow to an already small but hard-working and sincere Government service agency.

The Veterans' Employment Service is mandated by the people of this Nation and the Congress, under provision of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to cooperate and aid the United States Employment Service and State employment services to the end that veterans shall receive the maximum of job counseling and job opportunity in the field of gainful employment—

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The report of the committee shows that the budget estimates on the Veterans' Employment Service of the Labor Department was \$277,000,000, and the amount allowed was \$277,000,000. Therefore, it is rather difficult to understand the communication which the gentleman has received.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the gentleman from New York that on the basis of the information I have the budget estimate for the Veterans' Employment Service was \$1,583,000, and it has been reduced to \$743,500.

If the gentleman will allow me to continue with this letter, I will put all the facts on the RECORD.

The letter reads further as follows:

To reduce this splendid, compact, well-organized force of 176 professional field representatives, together with the 8 professional staff members located in Washington, a shell of some 53 field representatives and a correspondingly smaller unit in headquarters would simply render the Veterans' Employment Service incapable of performing the responsibilities and duties mandated to them by law.

Let us point out that there still remains a sizable future task to be accomplished in terms of employment of veterans currently being trained under programs sponsored by the Government. As of February 28, 1951, the Veterans' Administration cites 1,576,484 veterans in educational and training programs under provisions of Public Law 346. On this same date there were 93,604 disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation. The majority of these trainees are potential manpower for defense industry or activities contributing to the defense program. The present conflict in Korea and the increased mobilization of our Armed Forces can only result in a substantial increase in the number of disabled veterans who will require job-finding assistance. By late 1951 and early 1952 the Veterans' Employment Service will probably be faced with a situation which will not differ basically from that of 1945 and 1946. Thousands of servicemen will be discharged from service with combat disabilities and additional thousands with injuries resulting from training and other accidents. It will be the responsibility of the Veterans' Employment Service to facilitate their return to civilian life by finding them suitable employment.

Notwithstanding statistics which indicate that there are 62,000,000 people employed today and the labor market is tightening, the fact remains that there are many communities where employment is spotty. Many areas still have relatively high unemployment. Opportunity to materially reduce unemployment in these areas appears to be small because of geographical location, housing shortage, and inability of large number of workers to migrate. The particular problem as we representatives of the veterans organizations see it is that the Veterans'

Employment Service can make a most significant contribution in using its special facilities to gain for the veteran advancement from mediocre jobs to positions which will make full use of the skills he has acquired and the experience he has undergone in training.

The task of rendering special services to veterans in the field of gainful employment remains great. Current operations of and deployment of personnel of the Veterans' Employment Service is servicing efficiently and valuably to the welfare of our fighting men and women upon their discharge from service to their country. We believe that it is absolutely essential that their efforts and continuing positive accomplishments be maintained.

The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II at their respective 1950 conventions and encampments mandated full support to the maintenance of the Veterans' Employment Service and its operation of service to veterans in the field of gainful employment. We, therefore, the undersigned, respectfully request that action be taken which will result in the restoration of funds to the full amount as requested by the President in his budget for the fiscal year 1952—\$1,583,000.

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director, National Legislative Commission, the American Legion.

F. M. SULLIVAN,
Legislative Director, Disabled American Veterans.

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director of Legislation, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

CLARENCE G. ADAMY,
National Service Director, American Veterans of World War II.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the Senate will restore this cut, and that the House, in conference, will agree to this. This service, in behalf of our veterans, is most vitally needed and will be in the future.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payments to school district: For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), \$28,000,000.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 15, line 9, strike out the period, insert a colon in lieu thereof and the following: "Provided, That, for the purposes of this appropriation, (1) the local contribution rate computed for any local educational agency under section 3 of such act of September 30, 1950, shall be not less than 80 percent and not more than 120 percent of the national average local contribution rate during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and (2) the current expenditures per child determined for any such agency under section 4 of such act of September 30, 1950, shall be not less than 80 percent and not more than 120 percent of the national average current expenditures per child for the purpose of providing free public education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. NORRELL. I would ask the gentleman from Rhode Island to reserve

his point of order rather than make it, in order to permit me to make a statement.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my other amendment on page 16, line 3, may be considered at this time, for I am sure the gentleman from Rhode Island will make a point of order against it also on the same grounds. I make this request in order that my remarks may be directed to both amendments at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 16, line 3, strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "And provided further, That in the case of any application by a local educational agency approved after July 1, 1951, for payment under section 202 of such act, the amount made available by the Commissioner of Education out of this appropriation shall not exceed \$500 times the number of children with respect to whom such agency is entitled to receive payment under such section 202."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment also, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; and I reserve both points of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to consume the entire 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have consulted with the House Parliamentarian with regard to both these amendments. They deal with the law that we enacted last year regarding the school-aid program in defense areas both as to construction and maintenance.

I admit that my amendments, if adopted, would change the basic law of the land regarding these matters and, therefore, they are subject to points of order; this is legislation on an appropriation bill. But the facts are that since the enactment of this law last year certain weaknesses have arisen which should have the attention of this Congress.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE. I wanted to know if the gentleman's remarks applied to both amendments.

Mr. NORRELL. Yes.

Mr. SCHWABE. Or to only one. Would the last amendment offered by the gentleman be legislation on an appropriation bill or merely a limiting amendment?

Mr. NORRELL. I am advised by the House Parliamentarian that it is legislation, and I believe that is correct. What I say has to do with both amend-

ments. The construction amendment, however, deals with the matter of constructing these school buildings in defense areas. It is estimated that the eventual cost may run to something like \$500,000,000. If my amendment should be adopted it would reduce the Federal contribution in all the schools to a more conservative basis. The one on maintenance is this: It has developed that the Government must give to certain areas where they do not need much, if any, additional aid to schools. It is an enormous and unnecessary expenditure, but it must be made because there is no discretionary authority whatsoever in the Government officials who are enforcing the law. It has developed in other cases where a larger amount is needed. In certain areas they cannot under existing law get the amount they actually would need.

So my amendment, if adopted, would permit a variation or discretionary scope of not less than 80 or more than 120 percent and would not cost the Government any more money. I admit both amendments are subject to the points of order made, but I make this statement in order to get the matter in the Record. I am going to introduce a bill on the subject and I trust that the jurisdictional legislative committee will give it careful consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I admit that both amendments are subject to the points of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE in the chair). The Chair sustains the points of order against both amendments.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on page 27 of this bill is an appropriation for St. Elizabeths Hospital. I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the very excellent work being done at St. Elizabeths Hospital and to the fact that in the annual report of this year in relation to religious services provided for the patients the hospital has an unusual record. The superintendent, Dr. Overholser, who some years ago was Commissioner of Mental Diseases in Massachusetts, and a very fine gentleman, an outstanding member of his profession, has cooperated in every way possible with the Catholic priest, Protestant minister, and the Jewish rabbi.

In the annual report covering St. Elizabeths Hospital it is stated:

Regular services have been conducted for Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish patients. These services are well attended, and an effort is made to enable every patient to go whose mental and physical condition permits.

The report also states:

The hospital is fortunate in having a full-time Protestant chaplain and a full-time Catholic chaplain, both of whom are assisted in their duties by seminarians on a volunteer basis.

The report further states:

Jewish services have been held regularly through the Jewish Welfare Board and the Rabbinical Council. The Hebrew Sisters Aid Circle has assisted during the year in the religious services conducted for Jewish patients and in providing entertainment for holidays and distributing refreshments.

Further on the report states:

Both the Protestant and Catholic chaplains renew their urgent plea for a separate interdenominational chapel. The room at present used for chapel in the basement of Hitchcock Hall is wholly inadequate in size to accommodate the number of patients who attend religious services.

The need for a chapel for the hospital has been mentioned in annual reports for a number of years, but partly because the growth of the institution made such pressures for additional buildings the proposal to build a new chapel has not survived the review by the Bureau of the Budget. The request, therefore, has never officially been made to the Congress, and was not submitted this year in the budget estimates.

This hospital has about 8,500 patients. We can therefore realize what an important problem this is.

Furthermore, we all recognize the importance of religion and faith in our individual lives, and certainly that would have particular application to those in hospitals and probably extra emphasis should be laid upon those in mental institutions.

My purpose in rising to address the Committee of the Whole at this time is to have something in the RECORD to show that there is an interest in the near future in having such a chapel authorized and money provided for its construction.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee and the other members of the subcommittee as well as the members of the full Committee on Appropriations, if and when a budget estimate comes up, will give this matter their deep consideration, and I sincerely trust that when a budget estimate does come up in the future it will be favorably acted upon. Knowing the views and the sentiments of my friend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], I am sure that he will agree with that observation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. In the 5 or 6 years that I have been on this committee, we have never had a budget estimate for this particular program, but I think I can assure the gentleman, in agreement with the rest of my subcommittee, that if a budget estimate is submitted to this committee next year it will be given every consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of priorities in the construction program on the civilian level has come before the attention of each and every Member of this House in the form of letters from home from the various school boards and interested officials in the various school-building programs. I have in mind a particular program in my district where the school need is great indeed, yet there is apparently no ability on the part of the school board and the officials in that particular community to obtain the materials that they need.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is that in the Triple Cities area?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No; it is a little north of the Triple Cities. There are other parts in my district besides the Triple Cities.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Is the gentleman talking about Public Law 815, the school construction bill, or some situation which the Government does not have anything to do with at all?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am talking about the whole construction program on the home front. As the gentleman knows, for the past year there has been great concern on the part of the school officials and various leaders in separate communities over these construction programs. If you will recall, there have been instances in the case of every Member where he has been requested to see Charles Wilson or some other Government official so that we could get some kind of priority of construction material in various civic endeavors back home. It seems to me that while we are in this defense program that we ought to make allowances for the construction of schools and various community buildings so that as these defense programs grow, as workers are moved into one section or another, we will be able to continue with our community system. We do not want it to get the way it is behind the iron curtain where whole communities are uprooted and deprived of the church and the school influence and other beneficial institution that we, as Americans, have been accustomed to.

Mr. PERKINS. I assume that the gentleman from New York is well aware of the fact that the Federal Government only has jurisdiction in cases of this type in federally impacted areas brought about by the military and defense installations that bring about overcrowded conditions of nearby schools.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. School officials in our section want to be sure they are able to obtain building materials. How do we know that the Government will not crack down on them and deprive us of this necessary function?

Mr. PERKINS. From the gentleman's statement, do the schools that he has in mind come within the purview of Public Law 815 or not?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. All I can say to the gentleman is that we have to look ahead all the time. We have to look into the future and see what the possibilities will be, because within the next 6 months or a year or the next 2 years there may be a possibility of widespread cracking down on the procurement of various materials.

Mr. PERKINS. I assume again the gentleman is well aware of the fact that Public Law 815 takes care of impacted construction in impacted areas caused by the loss of revenue by the various

school districts by reason of military and other defense installations. May I ask the gentleman if that law is not broad enough to cover the specific instances about which he is talking?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In the next 6 months there may be a wholesale cracking down by Charles E. Wilson and some of the other high officials on the civilian population. We want to know what it is going to entail.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on page 14, line 3, the bill states:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Some questions come to my mind concerning this language. It appears to me this language is rather restrictive and may interfere with some programs which have been put into effect. May I ask some member of the committee if this language will restrict any of the work which is being done in connection with the GI training in distributive occupations?

Mr. FOGARTY. This law has nothing specific to do with the GI training. This appropriation is for distributive education under the George-Barden Act. It does eliminate distributive education under that act for the next fiscal year, insofar as Federal funds are concerned.

Mr. MARSHALL. No funds under the George-Barden Act are presently being used in connection with GI training?

Mr. FOGARTY. This program was established before the GI bill became law—several years before.

Mr. MARSHALL. We have received several wires from retail establishments in the city of St. Paul concerning the programs they have there of training people to work on display and retail advertising, and so forth. That has been done, as I understand, under the George-Barden fund. As I understand this language, it would knock out that particular type of training. Is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. As far as the Federal contribution to these schools is concerned, the statement is correct. However, it does not, of course, in any way prohibit the States from carrying on that work with their own funds.

Mr. MARSHALL. I understand, as the chairman must realize, that there are a number of schools that have set those programs into operation expecting the cooperation which they have had in the past with Federal funds.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. It seems to me it is unfortunate that this language has been written into this bill. Does not the gentleman agree that distribution is just as important in our free-enterprise system as production? In my own State it is going to mean that about 20,000 people who are now getting training will not in the future be able to get it.

Mr. MARSHALL. The language struck me as being unfortunate in the respect that this program has not been in operation any great length of time.

I think it was 1947 that the program was inaugurated.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I brought up yesterday a question similar to the gentleman's question, and I checked again last night. In my opinion, where this does tie in with the GI on-the-job training is that many mercantile establishments have been using courses set up in the high schools and other public schools under the Barden Act to fulfill their obligations for training under the GI on-the-job-training program. That was the reaction they gave me in trying to check up in response to letters such as you have had. In other words, the GI trainees are getting their training, the formal part of it, in public high schools under trade-association programs which are being financed by the Barden Act. So, so far as I can find insofar as that is true, there is somewhat of a tie-in between the GI training and distributive-education training under the Barden Act.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is a little difficult in setting up the departments in the schools to carry on certain types of training to draw the line quite correctly and undoubtedly there are certain programs which receive at least supplementary support. The chairman said it was not the intention of the George-Barden Act to use funds directly for that purpose, however. The elimination of these funds by this restrictive language may seriously affect some of the departments and the very schools where they have been making use of that particular type of program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my taking the floor now is more to ask the committee a question rather than to make any extended statement. I come from an area where the increase in population has been almost phenomenal. That is the Detroit, Mich., area. Detroit, as everyone knows, is a great center of production of the sinews of war. There was brought into that locality during the last war an immense population. These people have remained there. They did not move away. With the influx of workers and their families came problems which the local school boards could not solve. The result is they have to depend on Federal contributions to help them, if the cause of education is going to be served in that area.

There are several school districts in my congressional district which are vitally affected and where a situation such as I have described exists. From all over southeast Michigan, from my district as well as others, have come appeals from school officials to the effect that the amount provided in this bill is not adequate or sufficient to meet the problem and solve it. I refer to the language on page 15 under "Grants for school construction." You will notice it

says grants for emergency school construction, \$75,000,000. I have asked one member of the committee, and I now ask the chairman of the subcommittee, if the evidence submitted to your committee, when you were conducting hearings on this subject, indicated the amount was adequate to meet the problem when the Committee on Education and Labor reported the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; they did not so state it. They stated at the time we held hearings about 2 months ago that they had just submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a request for an additional \$100,000,000 for this fiscal year, 1951, and I have since learned in the last 3 days the Bureau of the Budget has allowed \$50,000,000 of that request. That request has been sent to the other body where they are now holding hearings on this very bill and on the supplemental bill.

Mr. DONDERO. And the indications are that that amount might be added to the \$75,000,000 provided in this bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I do not want the gentleman to be misled. That is not the \$75,000,000 that you have referred to, which is being appropriated for the next fiscal year. The \$50,000,000 I refer to is a deficiency appropriation for this fiscal year of 1951.

Mr. DONDERO. That is to finish the fiscal year?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding and absolute conviction that should this provision for \$50,000,000 additional—or \$75,000,000—\$25,000,000 of which is for this year, plus the \$50,000,000 supplemental which has been requested, be enacted into law, we will still be short some eighty or eighty-five million dollars of the amount necessary to cover already approved projects.

Mr. DONDERO. And, of course, we anticipate problems arising out of the present emergency program as a further Federal impact on local communities.

Mr. NORRELL. You have a problem which my amendment attempted to correct. In one area of the United States you will have a district that does not need any aid at all. In an area like yours you may need more money than you are getting. The amendment which I offered would simply have given the Department of Education discretionary authority to have used a little variation there from a minimum of not less than 80 percent to a maximum of not more than 120 percent.

Mr. DONDERO. There is a school district in my congressional district where the people have exhausted all possible legal means to provide adequate school facilities, but they cannot meet the needs. This is the only aid to which they can look to solve their educational problems. They even sent their high school students for their physical education to the Detroit House of Correction, a penal institution, because of the lack of space.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman, under Public Law 815, is absolutely correct in his statement. The reason that the Office of Education has not done more toward alleviating the situation that you have described, although Public Law 815 authorizes alleviation of those conditions, is because of lack of funds. It has been estimated that 697 school districts have made application for Federal assistance for school construction, under section 202 of this law. There are different sections of this law, in my judgment, which fit the situation which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] has described; namely, sections 202, 203, and 204. If we had adequate funds to implement all of those sections to take care of the Paducah, Ky., situation, and the Savannah River school housing under section 203, it has been estimated it would cost approximately \$380,000,000 to solve this problem amply. The authorization to take care of this situation, with the exception I have noted, we have on the books at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. Undoubtedly Paducah, Ky., and Livonia Township school district, now the city of Livonia, Wayne County, Mich., in my district are in the same position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a subject that is very dear to my heart, because I spent about 5 months with the Bailey committee seeing this problem in its reality in the South and in the eastern part of our country. What the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] says is positively true. If anything, the situation around Michigan is going to be worse in the next few years than it has been during the last 5 years, because you have a Federal influx in the area on the fringe of Detroit.

I do not know what the representatives of the Department of Education stated in their report to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, but I do know that in my State of Minnesota there are about nine communities that are affected with a Federal impact.

When I made inquiry of the Department, after this appropriation last year, and all of these applications from all over the United States had been filed with the Department, this is the understanding that I got from the Department in the allocation of these funds as prescribed by the yardstick in this bill:

It was a foregone conclusion that they had not nearly enough money to satisfy the eligible or legitimate requests. So as those applications came in, the policy was to make payment on the basis of those in most need—those districts which were most seriously affected, which meant that in the long run there would probably be 200 districts which, by law, were entitled to compensation, either under maintenance and operation or construction, but they would have to wait.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman and his committee came to our part of Michigan and made a very thorough and very conscientious investigation. In some of the areas that you visited the population doubled in the 10-year period.

Mr. WIER. And is increasing today.

Mr. HARRISON. Is increasing now.

Mr. WIER. So I say to this House as a friend of education, that this is a very blighted part of our needs in this country; it is a positive neglect in the interest of the ability of our Nation and our Government to provide any type of education for thousands and thousands of our children.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Would the gentleman suggest how we might proceed in order to get additional money to cover all these projects that are eligible under the law?

Mr. WIER. I think there were about 500 applications from school districts all over the country that could qualify under the act of last year. I venture to say that nearly one-third of those applications will not receive any money whatsoever because they are not the hardest pressed, nor will there be enough money to fulfill the entire obligation.

The only suggestion I can make during debate on this appropriation bill is that on the basis of the applications that the Department has today and that they have qualified as being eligible under Public Law 815 for participation, that the amount of money they find necessary today will be necessary during the next 2 years at least in lieu of our preparation and emergency program. I do not know of a community down South, in the Middle West, or in the Northeast that is going to be removed from this picture; as a matter of fact, I think in each one of these communities it will be increased.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If the gentleman will yield, he might include certain sections of the west coast.

Mr. WIER. I was not out on the west coast; I am speaking only of the places I saw.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I was eager, therefore, for the RECORD to show that there are areas throughout the country that are in just as serious condition. I am somewhat familiar with the situation referred to by the gentleman from Michigan and can confirm what he said. And in Richmond, Calif., where the population doubled within a few months, the city manager, speaking about the problem said:

The Government has cheated our children of an education; there are children in junior high school who have never gone to school a full day because of lack of facilities to take care of them.

Mr. WIER. I am aware that the same situation exists in a number of places in the State of Washington: Hanford, for example, Seattle, and Portland, Oreg.; and I think you could go right down the west coast to San Diego.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It is a national problem.

Mr. WIER. It is a national problem. I made reference only to those places that I visited to show this picture in its nakedness.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that if this appropriation is cut by the committee that we would be doing serious harm to our educational system all over this Nation. In fact the appropriation for construction and maintenance should be raised above the amounts now appearing in the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. It is not a question of being cut; it is a question if it is not raised by this Congress.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Oklahoma is correct.

I served on the Burke subcommittee, but only attended the hearing in Kentucky and acquainted myself with the specific problem that we have in Kentucky. I visited Fort Knox with the subcommittee. At Fort Knox we have approximately 150,000 acres that have been taken over by the Federal Government for expanding the military installation there, and as a result the schools surrounding the Fort Knox area are greatly overcrowded. They do not have adequate school buildings; they do not have the supplies, and, in addition, the counties surrounding this Fort Knox area have lost millions of dollars of taxable property.

The net result is that the school districts do not have sufficient money to spend for the education of the children brought about by overcrowded conditions in these federally impacted areas, and this legislation only applies to those areas.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I am in complete accord with what the gentleman states. The difficulty I find, however, is that what we have here in the form of an appropriation is merely enough to scratch the surface. The question involved today seems to me to be one where we still have to increase this appropriation, otherwise we are not going to accomplish anything. We are just fooling the people with what we have in this bill.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with the gentleman that the amount should be raised. The Office of Education informs me they have approximately 700 applications. Only 100 have received assistance. The Office of Education has undertaken to set up a priority system to give the more seriously impacted areas some relief but on account of the lack of funds the whole program has bogged down. That is not only true with reference to the construction phase of this program, it is also true as to maintenance and operation.

In Kentucky a total of 10 school districts submitted applications for Federal assistance for construction of school facilities under Public Law 815. Based on a preliminary review of the applications these school districts are entitled to receive more than \$2,000,000 according to the Office of Education. These districts submitted a total of 21 construction projects to use up this entitlement. They requested \$1,773,000 in Federal funds for construction and pledged a total of \$946,362 in local funds. The \$31,500,000 available for construction under section 202 of the act will only permit an allotment to less than 100 projects all over the Nation.

In my State, construction of school facilities on Federal property, on military installations at Fort Campbell and Fort Knox and Fort Breckinridge are now suffering from the lack of funds. I just mention these instances in Kentucky because the same situation prevails all over the Nation. Authorization, however, has been given for two of the military installations to proceed with construction in Kentucky while the application of the other is being held up on account of insufficient funds. We all know that Federal ownership of property reduces local tax income for school purposes, and we also know that a military installation or defense installation brings about an influx of persons into a community, resulting in an increased number of children to be educated. We are confronted with the problem, and we must solve it to the best of our ability.

The estimated requirements for temporary facilities for the next school year under section 203 of the act in two critical defense areas, Paducah, Ky., and Savannah River area, South Carolina, amount to \$10,000,000. It has been estimated that if all the projects were approved that are now eligible to be approved under Public Law 815, approximately \$350,000,000 would be necessary to fully implement the different provisions, sections 202, 203, and 204 of Public Law 815. This is not considering the maintenance and operation appropriation.

You can readily see that if they need \$10,000,000 for those two critical defense areas at Paducah and on the Savannah River, the Office of Education will have very little money left for these other impacted areas all over the Nation, which goes to show that the entire amount as recommended by the committee is entirely inadequate and should be raised.

Mr. ALBERT. Does it not come down to this one proposition, that either the Office of Education has failed to make its case or the Bureau of the Budget has put a muzzle on it? The committee has informed the House that the Office of Education has not made out a case for additional money.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the latter is true. The Bureau of the Budget has not given this problem the consideration it rightfully deserves and, of course, the impact is constantly getting worse on account of world conditions.

I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee in the Senate will give this

problem the utmost consideration, and that the Office of Education will also take another look at the picture. I personally believe the appropriations contained in this bill for the purpose of taking care of the school districts in these federally impacted areas are entirely inadequate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. The Clerk read as follows:

Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the act, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$175,000,000, of which \$100,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head: *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an amount equal to that part of the appropriation granted herein which is available for new obligations.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO: Page 21, line 13, strike out "\$175,000,000" and insert in its place the figure "\$250,000,000."

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer is on page 21, line 13, where there will be a substitution of the figure \$175,000,000 to make it read \$250,000,000.

I think that probably everyone here is familiar with this hospital-construction program. There was a great deal of talk about it last year, and what it has to do with is this: Originally, as I understand, there was to be \$150,000,000 for such hospital-construction program. As the result of the economic situation it was thought advisable to try and cut that down. Now, probably many of you have had communities where the people of the community have gone out, have raised money, have made plans to build these hospitals. I understand there is a very great need for them throughout the country.

Now, all of us here are trying to do what we can as far as economy is concerned. However, it seems to me in this situation where, as is generally agreed, there is a definite need for such facilities where, as I think all of us will readily admit, the people of the communities have gone out, have raised money, and have shown good faith in reliance on what the Government has in effect promised, that we should not go back upon our word and our responsibility. This amendment, if adopted, will, in effect, let the Government keep its word to all of the communities who acted in reliance on the Government authorization.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am interested in the gentleman's statement that the Government has given its word. Would the gentleman elaborate on the significance of just what has been done from which he draws the inference that the Government has given its word on any specific sum?

Mr. FURCOLO. I have drawn that inference from the original authoriza-

tion and also from the fact that in reliance upon that authorization people throughout the Nation in these various communities went out, had bond issues, raised money, and many of them engaged architects and had plans drawn and went ahead in reliance on what they assumed actually was a representation of the Government.

Mr. KEATING. Who made the representation as to what would be allowed?

Mr. FURCOLO. Well, I assume that it was first done here by Congress by the original authorization and then from that I suppose by the proper governmental agencies.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman knows full well that the mere passage of an authorization bill does not commit the Government. He knows further, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that no agency or no official of any agency has the authority to bind the Government just because an authorization bill has been passed.

Mr. FURCOLO. That is right. The mere fact that an authorization bill has been passed, of course, in itself is not conclusive, but may I also ask the gentleman from New York this question? Is it not a fact that in reliance upon representations made by duly constituted people in the Government and as the result of the belief that this money would be forthcoming, that plans were undertaken in all communities; that people went out to raise money through bond issues, in many cases with the approval of people in the Government, that architects were engaged, and things of that nature? May I ask if that is not roughly the situation?

Mr. McGRATH. My very dear friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] knows, on the premise he has set forth, what the answer would have to be.

Mr. FURCOLO. Would not the answer be "Yes"?

Mr. McGRATH. No. Of course, the gentleman's facts are not correct. Because an authorization is made does not justify anyone going out and seeking to employ architects.

Mr. FURCOLO. May I ask the gentleman from New York whether or not it is not a fact that as the result of the authorization and as the result of action taken by the governmental authorities, that the people of this Nation, in various communities, in good faith, acting on the reliance of that premise, did go out and do these things that I suggested? And is it not further a fact that practically all of the members of this committee have been aware of that, but that it is as the result of economy that this cut was made? Is that not the situation?

Mr. McGRATH. No, I do not agree with the gentleman at all. Some communities may have anticipated what would be done in the future, but in so doing they took the risk of their own decision.

Mr. FURCOLO. I think without any question the record shows, and the peo-

ple in the communities throughout the Nation know, that acting in reliance upon an authorization and upon what people in this Government had done, they went out in many communities and raised money, had plans drawn, and actually committed themselves in many ways, relying upon the word of the Government to carry through.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Is the gentleman's amendment to increase the appropriation from \$175,000,000 to \$250,000,000?

Mr. FURCOLO. Actually it is \$75,000,000 more for the building.

Mr. JONAS. I am for that program. Without any question the gentleman knows that practically throughout the whole United States, in the large cities as well as in the smaller cities, there is a shortage of bed space in hospitals. The people in these communities on account of the economic conditions and the high cost of living and the high cost of building have ceased to make contributions from the standpoint of private enterprise. If we are going to do something for the ill and the indigent from a humane standpoint, we have to look to the Government. I do not call this socialism, I call it good common sense.

Mr. FURCOLO. You cannot economize on dollars and cents where the health and lives of many people in the country are concerned.

All of us are in favor of economy, but this is not good economy. It is not sound economy where the Government in effect goes back on its word. It is not sound economy where the Government has asked the people of this Nation to contribute something to this program and they have done it, and then in effect we say to them, "We are sorry, we are going back on our word. The price of labor is going up. You have engaged architects, had blueprints made, located the land, and your people have contributed money, but we are going back on our word."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. On the matter of authorization, not giving anybody the right to assume that an appropriation would be made, I think, however, that all of these people who have eligible projects have just as much right to assume that their projects will be taken care of as somebody who is going to be taken care of under this appropriation bill.

Mr. FURCOLO. I agree with the gentleman.

As a matter of fact, there is a little bit more here than just an authorization. There is not only an authorization but also, as a result of that authorization, people throughout this Nation acted in reliance upon what they thought was the good faith of the Government.

No one in the Government before last year, at which time everything had already been done, indicated to them, "This is not going to be done." Whether legally or strictly or techni-

cally it amounts to anything is another question, but morally and in good faith there is no question at all, in my opinion, that the Government is not acting right with the people if they do not carry through with this project.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that his amendment calls for an addition of \$75,000,000, whereas the Budget Bureau requested only \$20,000,000 additional.

Mr. FURCOLO. It is interesting about the Bureau of the Budget. In my short experience here I have noticed that when someone does not want to do anything different than the Bureau of the Budget wants, he says, "This has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget." As soon as somebody wants to do something that has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, then the talk is, "Who is going to run this country, the Congress or the Bureau of the Budget?"

I do not say that either one is exactly right, but certainly the opinion of the Bureau of the Budget does not do more than create a rebuttable presumption. The facts here, in my opinion, justify us in overriding the Bureau of the Budget's opinion.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes, so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I want to thank the gentleman for offering his amendment. In the State of West Virginia we have 15 to 20 of these cases where they need hospitals and need them very badly. In this city of Huntington, a city of about 92,000 people, we have only six beds in case of an epidemic. I think the gentleman is entirely correct in stating that there are many different cities which went out and sold bonds. In Huntington they have already raised the funds and now the funds are idle and the people have to pay interest on the funds. I think the gentleman is entirely correct and is to be commended for the kind of amendment that he has offered.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I might say this: We are not going to save any money if we do not do it now. These facilities are going to be needed. The only thing that is going to happen is that we are going to waste some of the money that many of the people have put up in trying to provide the funds. Interest will have to be paid on that money. The cost of materials is going up and the cost of labor is going up. Some day in the very near future they are going to have to have these facilities. They will

simply have to be built at some later time at a far greater cost.

I do not want to be pessimistic, but if we pay any attention at all to the fact that eventually we may need greater hospital facilities as a result, perhaps, of the action of some other nation, we cannot begin to build the facilities after that happens.

I think from every possible point of view, in keeping faith with the people and on the basis of a true and sound economy the amendment should be carried, and I hope it will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this being an appropriation bill, I should say we are very much interested in the facts. I happen to have some facts or I would not be taking the time of the House today. I wrote the Joint Hospital Survey and Planning Commission of the State of New York, and I have a letter from the executive director, Dr. John J. Bourke, telling me just what the situation is in New York. I think the House ought to know it because I believe it does justify a more ample allowance for the support of hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act by the Federal establishment. I have no illusions as to the desire of the House to vote a \$75,000,000 increase. But I think these facts are important in determining our policy upon appropriations, and what I am going to talk about now relates to the policy that this appropriation ought to be more ample than it is.

In New York State the commission has authorized 62 Hill-Burton projects—on 54 of which work is proceeding—which call for an expenditure—and this is a very important matter to economy advocates—of \$54,000,000 but of which the Federal Government is only going to contribute one-third. So difficult has the situation been for the State of New York, by allowances which have been made available to it under Hill-Burton appropriations made last year which were very sharply cut, that it has had to put hospital projects on a split basis, telling the hospitals to go ahead and proceed with their construction in the expectation that they will get allocations from the Federal Government.

As a result of that situation the State of New York is faced, if it gets its part of what is provided for in this bill, with an allowance from Federal funds of three and a quarter million dollars this year, but 2½ million dollars are already devoted to going projects and it will only leave the whole State of New York about \$690,000 for other projects.

The executive director of New York State's Joint Hospital Survey and Planning Commission tells me that in New York City alone 20 to 25 million dollars are needed as Hill-Burton contributions for hospitals are a necessity to the community. In Nassau County right outside of New York City, \$3,000,000 is needed on the basis of estimated costs and a 33½ percent grant. In the city of Rochester, which may interest my colleague from that city, \$2,000,000 are needed, and in the city of Utica \$1,750,000 is needed on the same basis.

Mr. Chairman, the point is simply this, that building hospitals is not inflationary. Building hospitals is essential to our national security and national safety. Building hospitals represents an asset which is better than money and a great deal better than the gold buried in the ground at Fort Knox, and represents the creation of an asset and putting some of our resources into an asset vital to the future of our people. It is not inflationary to build hospitals for the benefit of the people of the State of New York or of any other State, and certainly it is essential to our national defense. When the program is established by as dependable a State agency as New York State's Hospital Survey Commission which finds it is needed and can be but insufficiently supplied under existing law despite the fact that two-thirds of the money comes from State and local sources, and when they emphasize that most of those hospitals, 83 percent of them, are voluntary nonprofit, nonsectarian, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish hospitals, the program appears to be eminently justified. You are not creating new Government facilities here but rather making it possible for Americans by voluntary means to help themselves.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HALE. There are several hospitals in Maine which are left stranded by the failure to appropriate adequately under this hospital legislation, the Hill-Burton Act, and they are hospitals which were started on the faith of this legislation. These partially completed projects certainly merit some consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. It seems to me we are here not only to save money but we are here to appropriate money where the money is deserved. That is our duty and that is our responsibility. It is clear, both on the grounds of solid benefit to the country and on the grounds of national defense, that we ought to have an attitude of greater consideration with respect to the hospital provision of this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a very popular proposal. There are a great many fine things proposed in this bill. I would like to go along with them. A lot of folks in my country need hospitals but I wonder if we cannot stop and look and listen this

morning, and think about the over-all question of the state of the economy of this Nation and what is going to happen if we yield to every request that comes here to do some of these fine things that we would all love to do.

We have been talking about economy here. You hear a lot about economy. Every man who gets up to offer an amendment says, "I am for economy but I am for economy for the other fellow." I spoke to one of my colleagues the other day in the cloakroom, and I said, "Now I think we have all got to sacrifice a little bit if we are going to balance the budget, if we are going to stop piling these taxes onto the people that they cannot pay. We are going to have to cut and cut everywhere." My friend said something that is typical of the situation. He said, "Yes, Judge; I am for doing it, and I will give them the very shirt off your back."

Is that what we are going to do here? I am for cutting these appropriations instead of adding to them, and I am going to try to have the courage to stand up here and vote to do it. And if it hurts me in my district it is going to have to hurt me. What are you going to do about these things? They are going to be coming up every minute in the day on every appropriation bill that comes up. They are things that you would like your people to have, but can we not stop and think about the sad state of the budget of this Nation, and whether we are going to continue to run a deficit, whether we are going to continue to pile up taxes to the point where the people cannot pay them? Let us think about this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to publicly commend the gentleman for the position he has taken. He is entirely right. He has the courage to state his position. It is time that instead of voting to increase appropriations the House should vote to cut them further than they actually have been cut by our Appropriation Committee. The American people are demanding economy in Government.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman. Let us do it on this bill and all the rest of them as they come along.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no argument on the question as to whether or not it would be a fine thing to build more hospitals for our country. There are other serious matters to be taken into consideration on this appropriation in addition to economy.

The gentleman's amendment boosts the appropriation by \$75,000,000. That is \$55,000,000 more than was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations held extensive hearings. The testimony with respect to this particular appropriation will be found beginning on page 633 of the printed hearing.

But here is the problem with which we are confronted. Even if they had this \$250,000,000, under the defense emergency program they could not possibly get the material to build the hospitals. Furthermore the drain by our armed services on the doctors and hospital personnel of our country has created a tremendous shortage in these professions. Furthermore, even if they had these hospitals, they could not possibly get the doctors and personnel to staff them. These are some of the major circumstances you have to take into consideration when considering boosting this appropriation \$75,000,000.

Every Member of this House is getting letters from his district asking him to cut the budget, to economize. You are going to get a lot more letters next year when the people get their new tax bill and wonder why you do not decrease appropriations.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Does my colleague from Illinois take the position that the additional appropriation of \$55,000,000 will completely overthrow, disrupt, and destroy the whole economic background of this country when we here every day are pouring out billions for war, billions for munitions, billions for outside questions, billions for appropriations to foreign countries, yet if we talk about spending \$55,000,000 for the sick, the indigent and suffering people of America it will ruin the country?

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not take that position. If the gentleman from Illinois wants to take it he can, but I do not. There are a lot of hospitals already authorized towards which we have appropriated some money, and new ones that have been contracted for. Furthermore, there is the cost necessary to build all these hospitals in all the communities of the country. Not but that it is good, but in the last few years we have had hospitalization programs by hospital promotion groups, and it has been so oversold that the people of the communities cannot afford to support them.

Mr. JONAS. Does not the gentleman know that these hospital promotion programs have all fallen by the wayside and are gradually disappearing? Does he not know that the hospitals we now have cannot take care of the sick people because the local communities find the burden too heavy to bear? It has gotten to be a national program; the National Government must aid in the construction of more hospitals.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will ask the gentleman a question: What is the sense of appropriating money when you cannot get the materials or the personnel with which to staff the hospitals if they are built?

Mr. JONAS. It is a sad commentary upon the intelligence of thinking people to put forth the proposition that we cannot spare material to aid the sick and suffering. If that be the case, then it is about time we made a change in the program and paid some attention to the sick.

Mr. BUSBEY. I stand with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]: You are either going to be economy-minded, or you are not going to be economy-minded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the gentleman from Virginia has well stated that we cannot afford at this time to accept any amendments to this bill which would increase the total of the money carried in the bill. We are in a very difficult position financially, and I cannot vote for an increase, even though it is for one of the most worthy projects such as aid to hospital construction. There are many things which are very desirable but which cannot be pushed as rapidly as we would like at a time like this, when we are threatened with an all-out war. I should like, however, to see an amendment in the form of a substitute for the gentleman's amendment agreed to whereby we could provide in this bill that priority shall be given by the various States in the allocation of new construction funds to those projects which are most advanced at this time in planning and financing. It is my intention to offer such an amendment.

Please allow me to call to your attention what the good people of one of my communities, Madison, Minn., have been up against in their wish to secure a much-needed hospital.

In December 1949 public-spirited citizens of that community worked hard to raise funds for Madison's contribution to the hospital. A total of 1,095 contributors pledged \$186,044 and the project seemed to be well on the way. On March 15, 1950, that community was informed by the Minnesota Department of Health that—

We have now decided that we will include general hospital projects on the 1950 construction schedule down to and including Madison. Because of the fact that your project involves Federal funds which are not as yet available to the State, we cannot encumber funds for this project until after the 1951 fiscal allotment becomes available, which should be about July 1, 1950.

Naturally, the Madison community looked forward hopefully to the summer of 1950 for their plans for a new hospital to become a reality. Plans and specifications were developed and a total of \$38,000 was spent by the hospital board for site, architects' fees, and such. No Federal money, however, was available and today this project lies dormant, a year after having been virtually assured that construction would commence last July.

Members of the House, place yourselves in the positions of members of that hospital board. What can they say to the 1,095 contributors who 17 months ago put up \$186,044 on the promise contained in the Hill-Burton Act, that the Federal Government would aid in giving to them a hospital to replace the present fire trap constructed in 1900. Ten thousand people in that county

need that hospital. It is because of cases such as Madison, Minn., and others scattered throughout the United States of like need, that I believe that the Congress should indicate in this bill its belief and intent that such communities, far advanced as they are in planning and financing, should be assured of priority as far as the new money, \$75,000,000 contained in this bill, is concerned.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. If the gentleman will read the table in the hearings, he will find that the smaller communities as such have received the bulk of the money rather than the larger cities.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That may appear to be the case but the facts remain that there seems to be no money available now for this project. The gentleman will recall that we had a supplemental hearing before the Bureau of Public Health last December on this very issue. There the question came up as to how much money would be required as far as the Congress was concerned if we were to allocate sufficient additional funds over and above the \$75,000,000 given last year so as to take care of these few projects scattered out in every State of the Union in which the people had worked hard to bring to a virtual completion their planning and financing, but just could not seem to get under the gate as far as receiving some of these Federal funds was concerned.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGRATH. I call to the attention of the gentleman that the allotment for his State of Minnesota is \$1,520,000 and that the item to which he refers in the Madison case calls for about \$228,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. I am simply urging that we make sure that the \$228,000 will be available. No definite priority is in this bill for the hospitals mentioned.

Mr. McGRATH. In this bill there is sufficient allotment and that project to which he refers will be taken care of under this appropriation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish the gentleman could assure me that this \$228,000 will be available. There are so many turns and twists in the road that I fear that small hospitals such as Madison will be kept at the bottom of the list, while large hospitals already under construction will secure more than their previously allocated share, so as to be rushed to completion in spite of the cost of materials and labors going up 15 to 20 percent the past year. It is because of this reasoning, that I propose to offer an amendment to give priority to the many small hospitals, of which Madison is but an example.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the interest I have naturally in my own project at Madison, I want to reiterate that I cannot vote for any amendment increasing this bill today. We can, however, help in seeing to it that the various States

allocate their share of the pending \$75,000,000 in such a way as to again restore faith in Uncle Sam's promise. Communities which have shown their good faith through their fund raising and their commitments should be given first consideration in this distribution of the money available this coming July 1, under this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I recognize at the outset that to speak against a construction program for hospitals is not a very popular thing.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. May I say to the gentleman that I am very much disturbed about the pending amendment which proposes an increase from \$175,000,000 in appropriations to \$250,000,000. The country cannot afford any more than it has at present. They were able to take care of almost everything last year with the \$175,000,000 and they will be able to do the same thing next year.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of economy, but I am not in favor of false economy. I believe the pending amendment proposing to increase hospital funds should be agreed to. Hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act, to my way of thinking, has made a great contribution in promoting the general welfare of the people in this country. As a result of this legislation, hospital treatment has been provided for the sick and indigent where otherwise such treatment would have been impossible. Many sections of our country still need hospitals and the people residing in those districts are looking into the future with the hope that they may be able to acquire funds under the Hill-Burton Act and construct needed hospitals.

In my district last fall one of the large counties voted by a majority of approximately 9,000 to 400 in favor of a hospital bond issue in order that they may be in a position to match funds provided under the Hill-Burton Act. The construction of this hospital in Floyd County, Ky., will require \$800,000 of Hill-Burton funds besides the one-third that the county is authorized to put up. A loan has been approved for preparation of plans for this hospital. The project has been approved by the State Department of Health and by the United States Public Health Service. The hospital is badly needed, and when completed and properly equipped, will serve a great area in the Big Sandy Valley. The people of Floyd County are very hopeful that their project may be completed in the near future. From a defense standpoint these hospitals that have been authorized should be completed. I mention this particular hospital, although I know there are numerous similar situations throughout the country. I personally fear that \$75,-

000,000 provided for in the appropriations bill for new construction is inadequate. For that reason, I am supporting the amendment to increase the appropriation.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee to the fact that the committee unanimously allowed the full budget estimate of \$75,000,000 for new allotments. One hundred million dollars goes to pay off contract authorizations and the additional \$75,000,000 goes for new construction. As of January 1951 there was a total of 1,497, roughly 1,500 projects that had been approved embracing about 73,000 beds and 225 community Public Health centers. We recognize at this time the difficulty of getting materials and because of that fact among others this appropriation has been held to this amount. I call your attention to the fact that at the present time there is approximately \$800,000,000 worth of hospital construction going on in the country. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] said that there was perhaps a moral obligation upon the Federal Government because there had been an authorization bill passed. Of course, the fallacy of that reasoning, I think, was pointed out very well by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] because if that was to follow, every time you passed an authorization bill you might just as well put in the appropriation at the same time and eliminate any hearings or examination as to whether or not the money should be allocated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO; Page 21, line 19, after "obligations" strike out the period and insert "Provided, That the funds provided for new obligations shall be allotted on a basis of priority to those projects most advanced in the planning and financing as determined by the several States."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the substitute that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. There is no question in my mind, Mr. Chairman, but what this amendment is germane. Certainly it is nothing but a limitation upon the expenditure of a portion of the funds contained in this particular paragraph. If we say, for example, that the States must allocate new funds in relation to the state of advancement as far as the projects are concerned, certainly that is a limitation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard in opposition to the observation made by the gentleman from Minnesota?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. McGRATH. I respectfully submit to the Chair that the Hill-Burton Act sets forth the priorities to be given

to the States and therefore this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is not germane. Being a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that brought this legislation to the House authorizing this program, I recall vividly the policy was adopted in that authorization program which left administration of the funds to the States, after the funds were made available. The authority to determine the utilization of the funds made available for the carrying out of this program is left to the States. Should a limitation such as the gentleman offered here be adopted, that would mean we would deviate from that policy established under the authorization of the program and consequently I think it would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the Chair permit a further observation?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Chair will notice in line 16 the provision "That allotments under such part C to the several States" and so forth and so on. If that provision is germane and in order, as it appears to be, why should not a further provision as to how the State shall allot the money, based upon the degree of advancement, be germane? The gentleman from Arkansas should either make a point of order against that provision also or withdraw his opposition to mine.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE). The Chair is ready to rule.

After studying the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, the Chair feels that this is a change in existing law, and therefore sustains the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

In regard to the second point raised by the gentleman, the Chair holds that because other legislative language may be permitted to remain in the bill, that does not make in order language adding legislation in violation of the rules.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order submitted by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS to the amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO: On page 21, line 13, strike out "\$250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$195,000,000."

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would it be in order to offer a preferential motion at this time, and if offered, could it be debated?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot rule on a hypothetical question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAWFORD moves that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Furcolo amendment be again read.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the Furcolo amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth: For pay, uniforms and subsistence allowances, increased allowances for foreign service and commutation of quarters for not to exceed 1,500 regular active commissioned officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular and reserve commissioned officers; for payment of claims for private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or damaged in the military service of the United States, as authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 222c, h; 42 U. S. C. 213); and for 6 months' death gratuity pay and burial payments for regular commissioned officers; \$1,900,000, and the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from appropriations made available to the Public Health Service for the current fiscal year such additional amounts as may be necessary for pay and allowances of the officers herein authorized.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 26, line 8, strike out "\$1,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,790,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this item appears in the committee report on page 34 in the table entitled "Title II—Federal Security Agency." It is the first item on the page of "commissioned officers, pay, etc." In 1951 the amount appropriated for this item was \$1,790,000. The amount in this bill is increased \$110,000. The subcommittee has done good work in reporting this bill in a number of ways and for that I wish to commend them and wish to say that I concur in that action. I feel, if it is possible to do so, no item in the bill should be increased. When I noticed the \$110,000 increase here I looked in the committee report to see what the justification for it was, and not finding any reference to it whatever I then discussed it with the subcommittee chairman and was informed that the justification for it is set out on pages 839, 840, and 841 of the hearings, which involve this particular agency and that this \$110,000 is supposed to pay for the retirement which is anticipated during the fiscal year of 19 commissioned officers. The testimony of Dr. Gillis with reference to that is as follows:

The estimated increase is due to provision for retirement of 19 additional officers. In view of the retirement of 2 officers for age is mandatory and 37 officers have the legal right to retire for years of service, and since past experience indicates an average of 17 retirements per year for disability in accordance with the Career Compensation Act, the estimate is very conservative.

I would take that to mean that year after year they would come along here

with a request for an increase in this bill of \$110,000, which does not seem to me to be a logical method of increase.

The Williams subcommittee last year investigated this agency and we investigated this particular part of the agency which is known as the Division of Commissioned Officers.

That subcommittee's report in dealing with this, had the following to say:

Another barrier to the attainment of good personnel management is found in the separate handling of the 2,141 commissioned officers in the Public Health Service. These officers are assigned throughout the service in both medical and administrative posts from a central division of commissioned officers with 72 employees assigned to its component branches as follows, and these are personnel employees which have a ratio of one personnel worker for every 30 officers. That is too large a ratio of personnel workers for the number of officers. Those 72 employees in the fiscal year 1950 were made up as follows:

Office of the chief, 6 employees; planning branch, 6; liaison branch, 9; recruitment and commission branch, 18; assignment and utilization branch, 6; training branch, 4; administrative management, 23.

Here are the duties of the administrative management as reported by them to that committee:

Administers program for assisting and advising officers and their dependents in obtaining benefits provided by law; reviews and processes disability claims; determines eligibility for campaign ribbons; arranges for authorization to wear decorations and medals; maintains liaison with Department of National Defense, Veterans' Administration and other agencies on matters of benefits and privileges; arranges for commissary and post-exchange privileges; provides income-tax-consultation service for commissioned officers.

The committee reached this conclusion regarding these 72 employees, particularly those 23 in administrative management:

Except for historical prerogative and a declining need for mobility in assignment, there is little justification for continuing this very elaborate and costly duplicate personnel office with a ratio of 1 personnel worker for every 30 officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know of a better place in the wide world to save \$110,000 than to vote for the amendment which the gentleman has offered. I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

In view of the extension of time, I would like to add to what I have already said that this is an agency in which the Williams subcommittee in its investi-

gation found that in the Federal Security Administration they maintained a purchasing operations division which employed 197 employees which processed a total number of orders per year of 121,014, 50 percent of which were under \$20 each, at an average cost of \$5 per order processed, and the number processed, the daily average per employee, was 2.4 orders, as I said at an average cost of \$5 per order, and 50 percent of them were under \$20.

As I stated, I think the committee has done good work in reducing the appropriations, but this is one item that has been increased. It is not justified in the committee report, and the justification which is given is what I have given you here, and I think the \$110,000 should be cut out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as many Members have done, I have spent a great many years of my life working in the areas of health and disease. May I say that I am very happy that you have seen fit not to make an additional cut in the mental hygiene appropriation.

I am taking these few minutes, Mr. Chairman, in order to suggest to you that it is time for us, as guardians of the purse strings, to consider as possible fields for research the basic causes of such things as mental unbalance and illness. To illustrate my meaning, I would like to refer the older Members of the House to a bill which I introduced some years ago to iodize salt to make readily available to the great masses of our people the ingredient necessary to health of body and mind in order to reduce the number of feeble-minded, mentally unfit, deaf mutes, and such that we are breeding in increasing numbers. My bill was rather dramatically killed by a parliamentary procedure on the floor, which prevented its coming to a vote. Did you know that every single soldier who went into the Army in the last war had nothing but iodized salt?

It has been definitely established by 30 years of research that iodine is absolutely necessary to sanity and healthful glandular activity. If you put two bricks of salt in a field, one iodized and one not, the cows will take the iodized salt every time. I could give you many illustrations of that nature.

Also, one of our South American Republics was virtually free of goiter corollaries. Then suddenly they began to have it. One of the research men was sent down from here at the request of their government. He found that the goiter began at the time when a very up and coming fellow had come up to the United States and liked the white salt on our tables. When he returned home he set up a factory and refined the salt, and goiters appeared.

I have given you this as an illustration of what basic research can teach us. Assuring the masses of our people a requisite amount of this necessary ingredient is one of the things that we could do to lower the number of people

for whom we now have to supply nurses and doctors and others.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other similar things that could be done fundamentally in the whole broad field of research. May I urge upon the Members of this body, and especially upon whatever subcommittee has to do not only with the health appropriations but also with the study of the various health measures that come to this Congress usually through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would urge it upon us all to do some very fundamental study between now and the next session of this Congress. It is evident that we must reduce expenditures. Let us reduce them in such ways that will bring benefit to our people rather than having to reduce them by having fewer hospitals than are now needed to care for our sick, for the 250,000 GI's who are mentally undone by this war, and for other tragedies of our civilization. Let us see what we can do to do away with the causes, let us not go on forever dealing merely with results of poor management.

I urge this, Mr. Chairman, and hope very much that during this next year because of very necessity we will force ourselves to look into these matters from this more basic point of view.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out he last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statement of the lady from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] on the subject of iodine. I realize that iodized salt is better than no iodine at all. Iodine comes from the sea. The States that border on the ocean, and especially the ones that border on the Gulf of Mexico, have the most iodine in their soil, and therefore the people in those States have the least amount of goiter or thyroid trouble.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. They also, however, have an increasing amount of cretinism, dementism, and various things of that kind.

Mr. RANKIN. Those maladies are caused by a lack of iodine; they are unknown in those States that have an abundance of iodine in their soil.

We have virtually eliminated malaria, typhoid, yellow fevers, hookworm, and various other diseases that were causing so much trouble in Mississippi, and many other Southern States.

Mississippi has more iodine in her soil than has any other State in the Union, except Florida and south Texas. If you people in the Northern States who come from the goiter areas—and you can get maps which will show you exactly where those areas are—if you want to get rid of goiter or thyroid trouble, the thing to do is to take no chances on artificially iodized salt, but to eat foods that are produced in those areas where the soil is saturated with iodine, especially in the southern areas.

If you would eat more sweet potatoes, molasses, and dairy products from Mississippi, you would protect yourselves against those maladies.

I remember serving in this Congress at a time when there were four Members from one of the Northern States who had been operated on for goiter. They came from a State that has no iodine in her soil.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would like to hear the gentleman's observation on the iodine content of Florida oranges.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to answer the lady from Ohio. But if you want the facts, I desire to say that there is nothing produced in this country that carries a greater percentage of iodine than the fruit grown in Florida and south Texas. Florida oranges and grapefruit, as well as oranges and grapefruit from south Texas, have more iodine than has any other such foods grown in this country. The same thing is true of milk products from Mississippi and other Southern States. The sweetpotato comes nearer having all the food values than any other one thing that is grown in the United States. And they all come from the Southern States, where the soil is saturated with iodine.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman say the same thing with reference to oleomargarine?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; if it is made from cottonseed oil.

If the gentleman wants the people of his State to get rid of thyroid trouble the thing to do is to drink milk produced in Mississippi.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Could I get a testimonial from the gentleman for Iowa corn?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I was just about to get to corn.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not do so bad by eating a lot of pork and beef either.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly not.

Mr. JENSEN. I am a pretty good example of what a person can grow to if he eats good corn and Iowa corn flakes as well as pork and beef.

Mr. RANKIN. May I also say that if you will get rid of this one-way freight rate you people are being punished with, as we are, so that you can process your own animal and corn products and ship them east instead of having to pay a double freight rate when you ship them, the people of Iowa will be a great deal better off.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. This also involves a mental question, does it not?

Mr. RANKIN. A mental question? I have been told that thyroid trouble, and

especially goiters, affects an individual's mind. I want to say to the gentleman from Maine that his rain comes from the sea. His area is fairly well supplied with iodine. But when you get to certain areas where the water does not come from the sea you will find the reverse to be true. I made an investigation, and in one State, I will not name it, they recorded 100 percent of the school children in a certain city as being affected with thyroid trouble.

This is one of the most serious questions that has come before the Congress, and I am telling you now that I do not believe you can ever cure it with iodized salt, although it does have a beneficial effect. If you will eat the foods that come from that part of the South where the soil is saturated with iodine, you will find it to be a great deterrent to the contraction and development of goiter, one of the most dangerous diseases in America.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment to reduce this appropriation bill further, by \$110,000.

First, however, I want to compliment and commend the members of the Appropriations Committee that has shown such a tenacity for economy in Government at a time when it was never more needed than it is in this particular session of the Congress. I also want to commend all of the members of the committee of the House who have helped defeat the prior amendment which would have increased this appropriation bill by \$75,000,000.

The people of our country are greatly concerned. I think the letters that are coming in, even those before the MacArthur incident, indicate that the people are concerned about the future of this Government and concerned about what the Congress may do, whether or not they, the citizens of the United States who really are the Government, may get a measure of relief from the Congress of the United States.

They are more concerned now than they were ever before, and they are looking to Congress now with greater intensity and greater hope, and may I say greater concern, than ever before.

Congress has made a splendid start in acting upon the appropriation bills that have come before this body recently. We can give the people some consolation and some hope for the future that no other person in government can give them, which they are so intently hoping for if we continue to show them that we are trying to protest their interest and continue to show them that

we will continue to stand fast for economy throughout this session.

I know there are likely to be those who will offer amendments to this bill to undo the work this splendid committee has done, to increase the appropriations, later on as we read the bill. I want to speak to you now and urge the Members of Congress to turn back and defeat every attempt to increase appropriations in this bill, and I hope that we will indicate our determination to do that by reducing this bill now by \$110,000 by approving this amendment.

We can give the people hope and consolation if we continue to stand fast for economy on the floor of this House not only for this bill, but as the days and weeks come. When we reduce spending, we lighten the tax load that much on the people. Congress has a great responsibility. You Members of the House have shown an inclination to measure up and face up to that responsibility. I hope we may continue to do so today and throughout this session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has given careful consideration to every request by the agencies that have appeared before it over a period of several weeks. You will notice in the tabulation at the back of the report that practically every estimate that was presented to the committee has been cut for fiscal year 1952. But I believe the significant thing in the report is that this committee cut practically every agency that appeared before it below what they had available in 1951—not the estimate, but we have cut below what they had to operate with in 1951. This relatively small item for commissioned officers' pay is one of the few items in the bill that shows an increase over last year. It shows an increase of \$110,000. That entire increase is made up of one thing, and that is for retired pay of officers of the Public Health Service and for survivors' benefits. That is all there is to it. It does not add any jobs to the Public Health rolls. That \$110,000 is made up completely of retirement pay for officers serving in the Public Health Service on the same basis as officers in the Army, in the Navy, and in the Coast Guard, and for survivors' benefits; for the survivors of those officers who have died whose survivors are eligible to receive benefits. That is what the entire \$110,000 amounts to. That is why we allowed it because we could not rationally do anything else. There is in the record a table showing the net increase of retired officers from 1947 to 1952. In 1947 there was a net increase of 22; in 1948, 12; in 1949, 16; in 1950, 28; and in 1951, 32. This next fiscal year, by the figures that we have, there will be 19 additional officers retired. This \$110,000 will go to meet that retirement pay and the benefits that will be allowed for the survivors of the officers who died.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, if they could reduce some

unnecessary employees, however, and save \$110,000 they could use that money to pay this retirement, could they not?

Mr. FOGARTY. We believe the Public Health Service is one of the best-run agencies in the Government. The record has shown that they have decreased their personnel in administrative services in Public Health administration whenever this was possible. It is a conservative administration of the Government. It is an independent agency within the Federal Security Agency. This committee has been very much interested in it and its operations. For 1952, the budget estimates for it show 533 less positions, over-all, than they had for 1951. The committee reductions make that even a higher reduction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to join the others in congratulating the chairman of this subcommittee on the work he has done in the interest of Government economy. However, I am not ready to concede that even further cuts cannot be made. In this particular instance, may I ask the gentleman if the committee's figures in their appropriations for this commissioned officers service contemplate the continued ratio of personnel employees to over-all employment of 1 to 30? What the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia intends to do is eliminate that elaborate and costly personnel ratio.

Mr. FOGARTY. The \$110,000 increase is mainly and solely for the purpose of paying retirement benefits to officers who have been retired in service and to pay survivors' benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That may be well and good, but do you intend to continue personnel employment at the ratio of 1 to 30 employees in the agency?

Mr. FOGARTY. I may say to the gentleman, who has served as chairman of the special subcommittee investigating some of these Federal agencies, that we have had his report before our committee in connection with the Department of Labor, especially the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but it was not until this afternoon, until the gentleman from Georgia brought this particular portion of the report to my attention, that the committee knew anything about this part of it at all. If it had been brought specifically to our attention during our hearings we would have gone into it as we did into the other report on the Bureau of Labor Statistics. But let us not cut this \$110,000. I will guarantee that we will go into it in our hearings next year in view of the report the gentleman has issued. If we had had that item brought specifically to our attention, we would have gone into it, but let us not cut out survivors' benefits and retired pay under this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 95, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance, \$1,600,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 28, line 23, strike out "\$1,600,000" and insert "\$1,463,400."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that this agency shows an enormous increase in the number of employees at a time when outside employment ought to diminish their requirements?

Mr. KEATING. I think exactly what the gentleman has said is true. The record indicates the average number of employees in this agency for 1950 was 264, and the estimated number for 1951 is 273, and the estimated number for 1952 is 313. All of this is happening at the very time when there should be less need for public assistance and at a time when there is a real shortage in the labor market and fewer people are on public assistance, and consequently the workload to administer the program is less.

I call attention to the record wherein the gentleman from Rhode Island inquired of the witness, who was appearing on this particular item:

In this tight labor market we are in at the present time, does it not seem that a downward trend for aid to dependent children would continue?

And the witness said that it might. Further, she said:

I do not think all the States have done a thorough job in canvassing all their recipients as yet so there will probably be a continuing decrease in old-age and aid to dependent children because of certain amendments.

We all understood the need to make adequate provision for this activity, but here is a case, similar to the one we just passed upon, where the committee has increased the figure above the figure for last year at a time when the trend in the country, insofar as employment goes, is up.

I want to echo what was said by the gentleman from Georgia in complimenting the committee on the many instances where they have made substantial reductions. I think perhaps the experience which we had on the floor with reference to the previous appropriation bill which we considered a short while ago has had a salutary effect on the entire committee. I am happy to see certain of these reductions which have been made, which are so necessary in these times of unusual defense expenditures. However, I hope that, like the previous amendment, this amendment will be accepted so that at least we will not, by the action we take, increase the amounts allowed over the amounts appropriated

last year for these administrative purposes.

I cannot understand why there should be need for additional employees. The alleged justification for this item appears on page 18 of the report, where it says it is to take care of within-grade salary advancements, projection of positions approved for a portion of the current year to a full-year basis, and additional expenses to handle increased work arising out of certain amendments.

It is not stated in the report that it is intended to increase the number of employees. However, it seems to me that in this particular activity it is definitely one of those cases where, instead of increasing the appropriation to take care of promotions, and that sort of thing, such needs should be absorbed and taken care of by a reduction in the number of personnel. As a matter of fact, I think I have probably been unduly conservative in merely trying to reduce this figure to the figure of last year. Certainly we should go that far.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman would also take into consideration the fact that in the Federal Security structure throughout the average wage or salary is \$4,500 a year, whereas in all other governmental departments the average is only \$3,600, so we can take that into consideration in voting for the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KEATING. I agree with that. I would say to the gentleman along that line that my figures indicate that the average salary in this agency is \$4,908. It is estimated that the reduction which is sought by this amendment might eliminate 27 employees from the payroll, but that elimination would still leave on the payroll 22 more employees than they had in 1950.

In these times, in that type of activity, important as it is, it seems to me it would be inexcusable for us to allow them a larger sum than they were permitted to have last year. If we are to make the substantial budget reductions in nondefense spending so necessary to the maintenance of a sound economy and, I might add, so essential in the long run to our triumph over the forces of those who would destroy us, such action must be taken on items like the one to which this amendment is directed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what the average money is for each child in a dependent family.

Mr. FOGARTY. In 1950 the average monthly number of families was 602,078; in 1951, estimated at 665,000, and in 1952, estimated at 585,000. The average monthly payment was \$72.02 in 1950; \$72.50 estimated in 1951, and \$74.25 estimated in 1952.

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is per family?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It seems to me that this is a fair amendment. We have in every town, in the State that I come from at least, a welfare agent in each city and town, however big it is, more help than is necessary. Then the State comes in with their staff of visitors and looks out for welfare. Then we have the United States coming in and they have a right to because they pay half; so we have three sets of people doing one man's job.

I know plenty of cases in my State where men have died or have left their families, men who were making about \$40 a week, men with six children. When he runs off, or dies, that family immediately gets \$84 a week, \$44 more than the man ever brought to the family; and the family was getting along very well on the \$40.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these cases ought not to be acted on the same, whether there be three children in the family or eight, because it does not cost any more to heat a house for the eight than for the three; and a lot of other expenses are of the same nature, rent, and everything else, yet they have a policy of doing this for everybody, no matter what his condition may be or the condition the family might be in.

There is not any earthly reason so far as I can see to increase the number of investigators or the people going around to take care of these funds, because we have altogether too many now; one is enough. In the town in which I live, a town of 7,000 people, we know the conditions of practically everybody who gets old-age assistance, or is on public relief or who receives aid for dependent children; and there is no earthly need of anybody coming in from the State and then on top of that from the Federal Government overriding what the local welfare agency does. If the people in Massachusetts really knew what we were doing they would rise up and say "You have got to stop this." A woman with five illegitimate children gets \$72 a week to take care of them. No one in our State can look at the public welfare books to know what this thing costs.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. The gentleman is bringing up a point which I think is very important; namely, the secrecy provisions of the Federal Security Act. Until they are amended to allow the States to publish this information so that the general public can find out about these billions we are pouring out it makes it very difficult and expensive to enforce. Our State of Indiana has already done that at their own risk of having these appropriations cut off. I now have a bill, H. R. 2738, pending before the House committee which proposes an amendment so that these facts may be published and so that more economy will result.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I am certain that these things ought to be changed. We are supposed to be living in a prosperous country, yet here we are appropriating a billion and a quarter

which the towns and cities will have to match.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment will bring the Bureau's appropriation back to what they had to operate with in the fiscal year 1951. You will notice that they requested \$234,600 more in fiscal 1952 than they had in fiscal 1951. This committee cut that request by about \$98,000. I think in things like this we have got to bear with the operations of the agency to some extent. The Ramspeck promotions, social-security taxes, and so forth, will amount to \$28,520. Bringing up to a full-year basis of the 14 new positions allowed them in 1951 will be another \$35,000. There is \$63,500 right there of the \$136,600 that we allowed them. If this amendment prevails, they would have to cut below the 1951 level.

Congress amended the Social Security Act in 1950 which meant that you were putting a greater work load on this particular agency by your action in voting for the liberalization of social security. As a consequence, they came in last year with a deficiency request, and as I recall, the Senate allowed them \$250,000 to hire additional help to perform the duties that this Congress said they should perform in connection with their work with the various States in carrying out this program. The House did not go along with that \$250,000 increase last year, but it was cut down to \$50,000, and only provided them 14 additional positions to work with these new amendments.

Here are some of the things they are up against. The Bureau will have approximately one and one-half positions to perform the various activities for each State program this coming year as they had for every two positions last year. In the past year, 1950, to accomplish the work of the liberalized amendments to the Social Security Act, the Bureau staff was required to work 2,900 hours of recorded overtime which they paid for during the period from July 1 to December 9, 1950, and an equivalent number of hours of unrecorded overtime performed by the top staff who received no overtime pay.

Mr. Chairman, this committee, ever since I have been on it, and the Senate has also done the same thing, has complimented the administration of this program. In 1950 Congress took action to liberalize the Social Security Act, which meant that they were putting on the shoulders of those people added responsibility they did not theretofore have.

If we are going to vote year after year to liberalize existing legislation, and to liberalize the benefits, I do not know how you are going to expect the agency to work with less than it had before. That is what this amendment will do.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In the questions which the gentleman from Rhode Island asked in committee, and I compliment him on his examination of the witnesses, he elicited this answer:

We are estimating 4 percent less in 1952 on old-age assistance and 11 percent less on aid to dependent children.

It seems to me to follow from that that with a lower workload they should at least not have a greater appropriation.

Mr. FOGARTY. I was not talking about administrative expenses, as I remember, in that question. I was talking about the grants-to-States program under that \$1,300,000,000. We were trying to get down to that. We knew at the time of the administrative set-up, we know of the requests they made a year ago because we had liberalized social-security benefits and that they needed additional personnel. They could not get what they asked for and as a result their backlog was built up and up, and even though their request shows only an increase of 13 percent, the workload that has been put on them by Congress has increased by 30 percent. That fact is shown in the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 74, noes 62.

Mr. McGRAH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. KEATING.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 78.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Salaries, Office of the Administrator, \$2,279,000, together with not to exceed \$403,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That the Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to finance the regional office activities of such constituent organizations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Page 31, line 6, after "Administrator", strike out "\$2,279,000" and insert "\$2,050,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It cuts \$229,000 from the funds appropriated to the Office of the Administrator, Mr. Ewing. This cut I believe to be justified in view of the findings of the subcommittee which I had the privilege to head last year, whose duty it was to make a study of the utilization of personnel in the executive agencies.

There are very many reasons why this amount should be cut. Perhaps it should be cut more than my figure would cut it. In the Office of the Administrator we found the ratio of personnel employees to total employment to be 1 personnel employee to 20 employees in the Agency. In other words, it took 1 man to handle the personnel problems of 20 people in the Agency. It is my understanding that in private business the ratio of personnel employees to over-all employment runs far above 1 to 150. There is no reason why Government personnel offices should not at least approach that ratio.

I may say also that we uncovered a report of the Federal Security Agency, embodied in the appendix of our report, which was startling. It shows that Mr. Ewing and Mr. Altmeyer spent thousands of Government dollars in visiting England and other countries where socialized medicine is practiced. Mr. Altmeyer even went to New Zealand. They came back and made a very elaborate report. If you will read that report you will find that it is most pointedly in favor of a program of socialized medicine here, and is nothing more or less than Socialist propaganda.

I do not believe there is any doubt but that here is one place where we can save for the taxpayers. I may say further it is my understanding that out of the appropriations to the Office of the Administrator are taken these so-called slush funds with which these \$50-a-day consultants are hired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the gentleman's amendment is in order, and I want to commend him on the splendid service he rendered as chairman of the subcommittee during the last year investigating the expenditures of this agency. In view of the report that was made as a result of the diligent effort of the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of that committee, I think his amendment is in order and should be approved.

In my judgment, that agency last year and the year before spent a great deal more funds than were absolutely necessary. This is a case where they can save a part of the funds that have been allocated to them and still do a better job. I think the gentleman will recall the hearings held by the committee disclose that in many instances they could have done much better work if they had not had quite so many employees in their service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Kansas, whose efforts contributed so materially to the success of our committee last year. I do not think there is any need to discuss this amendment further. The mere fact that it takes funds out of the office of Mr. Ewing, I think, makes it in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on

this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is again an instance where another committee has been investigating some of the various agencies and has not brought it to the specific attention of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I might say to the gentleman that copies of all of our reports were sent to each member of the Committee on Appropriations individually at the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress and also were provided to employees of the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. The only thing I can say about that is that many Members of Congress probably do not read all reports that are sent to them and perhaps they went into the wastepaper basket like some other things do. I think such matters should be brought to their attention specifically and should be brought especially to the attention of the subcommittee handling the appropriations involved, and we would look into these things.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is a very popular thing to call Oscar Ewing all the names under the sun and it is nothing new for this so-called Williams committee to be accusing Oscar Ewing of promoting socialized medicine, but before the Williams committee was ever formed, the subcommittee on appropriations that had been appropriating funds since Oscar Ewing has been Federal Security Administrator has been doing its job in the proper way and there is not a committee in this House that has been as tough on Oscar Ewing's appropriation as this subcommittee has been.

Every year they have cut his appropriation rather severely and it was at the suggestion of this very same committee 4 years ago when GEORGE SCHWABE was on the committee, when the Republicans had control, and when Frank Keefe was the chairman of the committee, that they reorganized the top level of the Federal Security Agency. I said on the floor, at that time, that I did not think it was a good thing to do. A year later, I had to admit in all sincerity and honesty that it was a good thing the way it worked out. They saved money. They saved a great deal of money and eliminated many positions. This year we cut them again. We cut them \$150,000 under the estimate, which is also a cut below what they had for 1951. It is not only a cut below the estimate, but a cut below what he had in 1951. If you go back to 1951 you will see his agency was also hit hard last year in our report and in our appropriation bill.

What are we doing with an amendment like this? You have field offices all over the country. Is there any breakdown of this pending \$229,000 de-

crease? Not a bit. That is the type of legislation you are getting here. When Members offer amendments they do not know just what part of the service will come under it. Is this \$229,000 to be a cut only on the field offices? If you vote for this amendment, he can apply it there. He can make a cut against every field office throughout the country and not touch his own. But we in the committee, if you will read the committee report, provided that none of the committee cut shall be applied to any regional office. We want those regional offices kept intact, and we applied the cut against his own specific offices here in Washington. That is the reasonable way to do it, if you want to make cuts in Federal expenditures. You should find out where the cuts should be made and demand that they be made in those particular places.

We say in our report:

Activities embraced include general executive direction, program coordination, field services, including management and house-keeping costs in agency regional offices—

Which takes in every regional office in the country, and—

publications and reports, and administrative services at the agency level.

But we spelled out in our report exactly where we wanted the cut made.

He wanted two additional positions for program coordination and development. He wanted them a year ago, but we did not give them to him. He wanted them this year and we refused to give them to him.

We say further in this report:

For the past 2 years the committee has denied increases for this on the basis that it saw no justification for enlarging the staff, and there is essentially nothing new in the picture at this point. The cut is also directed at the items for general administration and direction, publications and reports, the merit system staff, and administrative services.

That comes under his immediate offices.

These groups can stand a cut without impairing essential staff and services at these levels, provided the most effective use is made of the staff and all nonessentials are dispensed with.

Now, this committee, on its own initiative, under Republican administration in the Eightieth Congress, took the initial step to reorganize this agency. They saved the taxpayers considerable sums, and they did it in a scientific way. They knew what they were doing. I disagreed with them at that time, but I had to subsequently admit they were right. We have given this thing thorough consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. On page 19 of the committee's report you very emphatically state that the Federal Security Agency is not a defense agency.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is there any reason why Mr. Ewing cannot tighten his belt along with the rest of the American public?

Mr. FOGARTY. When we cut him a year ago—if you will go back and see what we cut him in 1951—you will notice that in the past 3 or 4 years he has been cut every year. Our bill for 1952 cuts him below what he had in 1951. If you will go over every other agency and do what we have done in this one, you will get real economy and get it in an intelligent way, but not the way you propose to do it in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 101, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Administrator, including salaries for the Division of Service Operations; and purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; \$711,500, together with not to exceed \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That the Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to cover the charges for services, supplies, equipment, and materials furnished.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while we are considering appropriations for these various agencies I should like to say that on the news ticker in the Speaker's lobby is shown the statement of the Treasury of the United States at this period. In it there is an item which interests me greatly, and I cannot find any explanation for it; perhaps the appropriate committee of the House can. It shows that on the 17th day of April 1950, the gold supply of the United States, I suppose that means in Fort Knox and the Federal Reserve bank, was \$24,246,684,051.28; and this year on the 16th of April, a year later, it is \$21,806,609,160.71. That shows a drop in the gold stocks of the United States of \$2,440,074,890.57 in 1 year.

I would like to know where that gold has gone and why. You and I all know that the world price of gold in terms of our paper dollars or credits is far higher than the official valuation we place on it here in the United States; I think a fair average is on the order of \$57 an ounce throughout the rest of the world, while our price is \$35 an ounce. If you took \$2,440,000,000 worth of gold which is about 2,400 tons of gold, and sold it in foreign markets for what you could get for it you would make about a 60 percent profit on it, and that profit I figure would be about \$1,450,000,000. Now, while we are talking about cutting appropriations by \$110,000 or something of that sort in order to save some of the taxpayers' money, perhaps we ought to find out what has happened to this two-billion-odd dollars worth of gold that was in Fort Knox last year and is not there now.

I suggest that the appropriate committees of this House make inquiry—perhaps it is all right, but it is not in the United States Government Treasury and I know it is in none of your pockets, because it is against the law for you to have it. The only place I can think of that it might have gone is abroad; and you do not ship 2,000 tons of gold abroad without somebody finding out about it. That is a lot of gold; that is one-tenth of our entire stock; that is one-fourth of a 10,000-ton shipload. Somebody ought to know where it is. Has it been transferred to foreign governments? And, if so, to what governments? If it has been paid out to private foreign companies for the purpose of purchasing strategic materials, at what price was it used to pay for the strategic materials? If that price was \$35 an ounce, then, of course, they have a 60-percent profit on our gold in the foreign market and that is a sweet profit.

It seems to me that as this gold is supposed to be backing up some of this "lettuce," as they call it, that floats around the United States, the green paper money that you carry around in your pocket, I would like to know where 10 percent of the gold backing of the United States paper dollar has gone. If memory serves me correctly, just prior to the war we had something like \$27,000,000,000 worth of gold at Fort Knox, \$26,000,000,000, some odd hundreds of millions, I cannot recall the exact amount; but now it is down to twenty-one billions. How much farther will it go? How far can it go? Will the Committee on Banking and Currency tell us, for example, without causing us concern in reference to backing of the Federal Reserve notes?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The thought has not just occurred to me, but a lot of this \$2,500,000,000 of gold has gone abroad because foreign nations are now beginning to demand gold in payment for their bills of exchange, and so forth. We can expect that flow of gold to continue out.

Mr. HINSHAW. What right have they got to it when Americans cannot have it? That is what I would like to know. I suggest that the appropriate committees of the Congress find out what is going on. If it is all right, that is satisfactory with me, I, then, have no criticism to make here, but I would like to know where it is going and why.

The Clerk read as follows:

Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal excess property for educational purposes and protection of public health, \$300,000.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 32, line 10, strike out "\$300,000." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$50,000:

Provided, That \$40,000 of such amount shall be available to the Commissioner of Education to carry out the above-specified provisions of law with respect to disposal of excess property for educational purposes and \$10,000 of such amount shall be available to the Surgeon General to carry out the above-specified provisions of law with respect to disposal of excess property for protection of public health."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I may say I think the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 32, line 10, strike out "\$300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, if adopted, will reduce the amount of our appropriation for the next fiscal year from \$300,000 to \$100,000. This is an activity that was created shortly after World War II for disposal of the surplus property of the armed services. I think a reasonably good job has been done. I am not here to criticize, but the job has been done. The work is over. They have a skeleton force that needs employment. I am not even trying to get these men discharged. But they are doing but little, if anything, where they are presently employed and if my amendment is adopted all they will have to do is to get transferred to some other branch of the Government having important work to be done, possibly at an increase in salary, and go their way. Nobody will suffer. They can then make a useful contribution, possibly in the war effort. We are all trying to save money. This is a great subcommittee, and I trust that the Chairman will not oppose reducing this amount from \$300,000 to \$100,000. The work has been done. Last year the budget estimate was \$333,300. This great subcommittee allowed every nickel they asked. This year they made some progress. The Bureau, instead of asking for exactly what they had last year or during the current year, made a request for \$333,000. They saved \$33,000 somewhere, and I commend them for that. This committee has allowed them \$300,000 for the next fiscal year. The war has been over a long time. Many of us believe we are right on the brink of world war III. Is it not about time that we got rid of the organization that was set up to dispose of the surplus property from World War II? This amendment ought to be adopted and really and truly the entire amount ought to be dispensed with. However, we can permit this agency to continue until July 1, 1951, on this present appropriation and then allow them \$100,000 under my amendment and then permit

the agency to be discontinued on and after July 1, 1952.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], but I do not believe his figures are correct. It is true that this surplus property disposal unit was set up to dispose of surplus property including that from the last war. He said we did not cut them any a year ago. We cut them from \$358,000 to \$333,000 a year ago. This year we cut them 10 percent, which is not a very big reduction in a small unit like this, and we allow \$300,000 to run this unit for the next fiscal year. In this fiscal year they expect to collect over \$350,000 in income from this operation, which is turned into the Treasury. In other words they will show a profit for the Federal Treasury of \$50,000 or more because their appropriation is less than the income. If you eliminate this program today you are going to hit every institution in every State of the Union that gets the advantage of the surplus. They have all obtained some surplus property from these defense and other Federal sources, both personal and real estate, and this organization has done it. They have also given assistance to health units throughout the country. In the past 5 years about \$1,200,000,000 has been transferred to educational and public health institutions. Property which cost the Government approximately \$65,000,000 has been recaptured in the past 7 or 8 months by this particular organization, and if it had not been for this organization, may I say to the gentleman from Arkansas, it would have cost the Federal Government huge sums to build or acquire the facilities that they have recaptured through the recapture clause that they have in every transfer contract that they let in every community throughout the country. This is operating under the emergency program we are in at the present time. The committee recommended a 10 percent cut. In view of the facts before us, if you are going to cut this you are perhaps going to hit every county in Arkansas. There is probably not a county in Arkansas that has not benefited by this particular program. I think Arkansas alone has received at least \$29,444,000 worth of surplus property at no cost to them at all, and all the educational institutions in the country have received help from this particular program, and they are still receiving help. There was some freeze put on this material last fall or last summer, but it now again is flowing into the local educational institutions and public health centers all over the country at no cost to them. If it had been put on the market like these things that the Bonner

Committee is turning up, it would have caused a furor such as you probably never before heard. But, this has been one of the best run programs. It has been beneficial to the Federal Government; it has been beneficial to every community in this country that has taken advantage of it.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I said the Bureau had done a good job, but I also said I thought the work had been done. I read the gentleman's report and I read the questions asked by the gentleman from Rhode Island as well as those asked by the gentleman from West Virginia. The report shows that the job has been done. If my amendment is adopted, they will have this year's money to operate on until July 1. My amendment would not abolish them but would simply take two-thirds of the money away from them and look forward, maybe, to winding up the business another year.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think if we want to lay the cards on the table the gentleman's amendment should be to wipe out the entire agency as of July 1, because there is no need of giving them one-third of what they need to operate with. They cannot operate efficiently, and it will be a cost to the Federal Government and a cost to every taxpayer if you go through with this type of proposition. They just cannot operate efficiently on \$100,000.

Let us lay the cards on the table. If you do not want this agency to exist any longer, if you do not think there is need for it, if you do not think the educational people in every State of the Union are for it, you have another think coming. Let us lay the cards on the table. Let us either take it all out or give them enough to operate on efficiently.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GATHINGS) there were—ayes 104, noes 74.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday when I spoke briefly with reference to the matter of vocational education and distributive occupations I did not have before me a very valuable report from the department of education of my native State of California, dated June 30, 1950. That booklet has been placed in my hands in the last hour, and I feel the House ought to have some of the important figures therein contained. I am sure the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should contain them. I realize we have now passed that place in the bill where an amendment is possible, but I am sure you would want this valuable information, and that it will help correct misapprehensions present. I am also sure that if the Committee of the Whole had had this information earlier in the day it might well have favorably considered an amendment reincorporating this sub-

ject of distributive education with modifications as to some items which might be stricken. This report which I have is signed by Roy Simpson, superintendent of public construction of the State of California. It shows that in the State of California, and I take it in most States, this program which is being now eliminated under the terms of this bill as it now stands was instituted in 1937 in 31 communities in California, and then had 5,306 part-time classes, and, from 1937 until this date, 1950, the number of communities participating in this grant program, in which the States bear half and the Federal Government half, has increased to 129 cities. The number of students in this program, just in one State alone, in California, is over 60,000, as of June 1950.

The State of California Legislature the other day passed a resolution against deleting this amount in this bill, I am just informed.

Another important item of information which we should have in this Committee is this: That in 1937, when the program was first instituted in California, there were only 93 classes. Last June, in the State of California alone, there were 1,123 classes, and there were part-time instructors numbering 489.

On yesterday I called your attention to the fact that two important telegrams were received by me. I wish to reemphasize those telegrams and call your attention to the one sent to me by Mr. Hollingsworth, head of the vocational department of our Long Beach city schools, which contains this language:

SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIF., April 16, 1951.
Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives:

Just learned that \$10,000,000 was restored to the budget bill for vocational education, but \$1,500,000 was deducted for the purpose of abolishing distributive education program. Understand appropriation bill will be heard on the floor of the House of Representatives Tuesday, April 17. By abolishing this valuable program at this time it will deprive 129 school departments and 60,000 students of the training and distributive education. Hope you can do something on behalf this fine program.

JULIAN A. MCPHEE,
President, California State Polytechnic
College.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., April 16, 1951.
Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington:

Knowing your interest in education following is sent as a guide. Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill to be voted upon Tuesday April 17. Bill omits inclusion of distributive education. Douglas Newcomb, school superintendent, Long Beach Sales Executive Club and Retailers Associated urge reinstatement of distributive education as training field continued through past world war merchants prices fixed. Losing experienced salesmen to war plants. Decreased efficiency increases cost prices and damages public morale. Trained replacements needed. Federal money matched by State.

J. E. HOLLINGSWORTH.

The minute I saw that telegram, with the Long Beach Sales Executive Club and Retailers Associated of the city of Long Beach referred to, I realized that

they speak for heavy taxpayers in my city and State. I also knew full well, because I know many of those executives, that when that telegram came to me from those groups, that they would not ask me to support any program which was not recognized by them, being heavy taxpayers, as a very, very valuable program. The telegram included approval from heavy tax-paying groups.

I have here a letter from the department of education, commission for vocational education of the State of California. I had the pleasure of serving on the State board of education of the State of California for a couple of years and at that time, in some small way at least, the value of this distributive education in my State came to my personal attention and just now Mr. Smith, the State director of vocational education, has communicated to me, and he says in his letter, just arrived:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
COMMISSION FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Sacramento, April 16, 1951.
The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: We have just learned that the House Appropriations Committee has recommended \$18,223,261 for the George-Barden vocational education fund. This amount reflects a 100-percent elimination of financial assistance for distributive education. The amounts for trade and industrial, agricultural, and homemaking aspects of the total vocational education program have been restored.

This letter has as its purpose to protest this highly discriminatory action. To single out distributive education for complete elimination just doesn't make sense, especially in these days when the total manpower, not merely the production phases only, must be at the highest possible point of efficiency.

In California we are serving 129 communities this year in a program which has been a vital and integral part of our public-school system for almost 15 years.

While we all recognize the utmost importance of eliminating excessive Federal expenditures, elimination of the \$1,500,000 involved in this national program seems to be completely false economy. This is especially true when the result would be to deprive one segment of our working population of its right to learn, to enter, and to advance in an occupation.

The legislature of this State has adopted a resolution protesting such action. The public schools and the entire distributive phase of our economy appeal to you and your California colleagues to prevent such action.

We wish there was more time in order to make you completely aware of the emergency nature of this matter. The report was made public by the Appropriations Committee on Friday, April 13, and we understand the House of Representatives may take action on the matter on Tuesday, April 17.

We will appreciate any assistance you may see fit to render in securing restoration of the funds for distributive education.

WESLEY P. SMITH,
State Director of Vocational Education.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote from the 1950 report of the State of California Board for vocational education a few statements and figures.

It may be that some of the items which the distinguished subcommittee

recommended should be eliminated during these days when we must only pay for the most essential. But gentlemen, that is no justification for so suddenly slaughtering all the program.

From the said report, I read:

PREFACE

The past year in distributive education in California included among its many achievements substantial increases in enrollments, communities served, classes offered, and the number of business specialists who served as instructors. The report of the year is presented in this bulletin of the Bureau of Business Education. It provides a splendid example of what can be accomplished when educational agencies, business, labor, and civic groups work together.

In the coming year, attention will need to be centered on the ways in which distributive education can assist in the war economy. The lessons learned a few years ago in a similar situation will be of value. Distributive educators will find many opportunities for gearing their programs to the changing conditions and needs of business in the days that lie ahead.

ROY E. SIMPSON,
Superintendent of Public Instruction
and Executive Officer, State
Board for Vocational Education.

THE MANPOWER SITUATION

The present appears to be a period of adjustment—and it is a little too early to foresee the extent of the shift to military activities, particularly as it creates shortages of workers in business occupations. Judging from the previous war situation, employees of distributive organizations will be drawn into war employment. In many instances their jobs may be covered by the remaining force. In other cases, new personnel will be required.

A major factor in this problem and one not possible to forecast accurately is whether large-scale war is imminent. It may be that we are faced with a prolonged period of tension without large-scale war.

RETAILERS COOPERATE

An important development of recent days is the organization of the retailers of the United States as a first line of defense against the inflationary pressures inherent in the national rearmament program. Representatives of every branch of the retail industry at a recent meeting in Washington, D. C., formed a special retail industry committee to cooperate with the Federal Government in planning for future regulations and possible controls.

The objectives of the committee include the following: "American retailers are united in their awareness of the inflation hazard of the present emergency. We have pledged our opposition to any force which might accelerate the upward price spiral. It is a further objective of the retail industry committee to establish a liaison relationship with Government so that the retail industry may effectively plan a constructive part in national planning for whatever emergency may occur."

IMPLICATIONS FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

The flexibility and resourcefulness of distributive education are certain to be called upon increasingly as the change from peacetime to a wartime economy develops. There will be need for training of replacement workers in all fields of distributive activity; for supervisory training courses; for institutes and clinics to bring information and help to businessmen in business operation during controls and shortages, if these eventuate; for continuing courses that are essential to every program including food handling and sanitation, salesmanship and customer relations, human relations training, and others; to list only a few responsibilities.

Cooperative classes will be an increasingly important means of helping businessmen meet the needs for wartime personnel.

TABLE I.—Communities served by distributive education in California and enrollments by years 1937-50

Years	Communities	Enrollments	
		Evening and part time	Cooperative part time
1937-38	31	5,306	93
1938-39	33	15,651	198
1939-40	61	22,265	268
1940-41	57	25,952	389
1941-42	123	28,403	236
1942-43	60	14,903	134
1943-44	36	12,063	124
1944-45	43	21,792	214
1945-46	54	23,248	237
1946-47	65	37,578	618
1947-48	82	38,147	875
1948-49	129	59,292	1,155

TABLE II.—Distributive education courses and instructors in California by years, 1937-50

Years	Classes	Instructors
1937-38	93	45
1938-39	400	147
1939-40	399	160
1940-41	540	208
1941-42	600	256
1942-43	669	107
1943-44	515	107
1944-45	439	92
1945-46	565	252
1946-47	678	244
1947-48	770	286
1948-49	813	406
1949-50	1,123	489

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the Nation owes a debt of gratitude for the fine work accomplished by the Senate Crime Committee headed by our colleague in the Senate, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. The evidence unearthed by the committee reveals the existence of organized interstate crime conditions in excess of anything we had imagined. There is certainly ample evidence of the need for appropriate Federal legislation in this field, and the need for new legislation to stop the organized activities of these gangsters.

In my opinion, if we are to gain the fruits of the work done by Senator KEFAUVER and his committee, we should establish a joint House-Senate watchdog committee. The watchdog committee would have two principal functions: First, to keep a careful check on the various Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of enforcement of Federal laws. Secondly, the watchdog committee could investigate from time to time serious crime activities over which the Federal Government would have jurisdiction.

To work in conjunction with the watchdog committee an independent crime commission should be established, made up of outstanding citizens. The crime commission could work with various State and local crime committees

in order to maintain a continuing surveillance of large scale criminal activities in the various States. Under my proposal, the crime commission could report directly to the watchdog committee from time to time.

In the past, much of the great good accomplished by special investigative committees of both the House and Senate has been lost by the failure of Congress to follow through on the original investigations. The establishment of a joint House-Senate watchdog committee will give assurance to the country that the Congress will not repeat the tragic errors made in the past. It will be notice to the underworld that this is not just another investigation, but the beginning of a real and sustained effort by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States to eliminate organized gangsterism and organized criminal syndicates in the United States. My early experience as State prosecutor taught me that it takes more than half-way measures to eliminate crime.

A joint committee will be more effective than a single committee, because the House of Representatives has original jurisdiction in many of the problems relating to crime. For example, all questions dealing with tax problems must originate in the House of Representatives under the Constitution. This is likewise true of other questions that arise in connection with violation of Federal law.

It is my intention to join with Senator KEFAUVER in supporting the establishment of a joint watchdog committee. Having followed the work of Chairman KEFAUVER's committee and the recommendations that he has made, I know that the suggestions I have made are in accordance with his views.

I will within a few days introduce in the House a concurrent resolution to provide for an effective Senate-House watchdog committee.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to my able colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. I would like to commend him on it. I hope the House will follow through on his splendid suggestion. I would like to tell the gentleman that a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means has been working on one of the subsidiary problems that the gentleman mentioned; namely, the narcotics trade in the United States. We have discovered far-reaching implications in this trade.

I am also happy to tell the gentleman that we have recommended legislation, which will soon be reported to this body for action. I commend the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for the efforts that he has made and the leadership he has provided in his committee to bring out the necessary legislation. He has hit at something very important, and that is the necessity for a joint committee of the House and Senate, because in many cases the House has original jurisdiction in matters relating to criminal activities. In other words, the whole question of tax viola-

tion is a matter of original jurisdiction in the House, and that is why we need a joint committee.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If the gentleman will yield further, there is also the question of overlapping jurisdiction on the part of different committees, and I think that would be one of the real achievements of the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman is right.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to commend the gentleman on his very fine statement. I would like to call attention to the fact that 3 or 4 years ago we organized a crime commission in California, and Governor Warren appointed ex-Admiral Stanley as head of it. He pointed out in his report that crime was interstate and that you could not define it to any one territory; that you must have some interstate legislation in order to reach the underworld effectively. I think the scheme you have proposed will do that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman. I think the evidence unearthed by the Kefauver committee has proved beyond doubt the existence of an interstate crime syndicate on a scale that most of us had not imagined at all.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from California on the interstate interest in the problem that the gentleman has presented to the House. As one member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would like to advise you that our committee has been interested in the problems which the gentleman mentioned, and would like to recall to his attention the fact that this committee did report out a bill on the slot-machine syndicate only in the last Congress.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct, and that simply confirms the need for joint House and Senate action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the inquiry made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] concerning the gold reserve in the United States, I would like to read a letter I received from Mr. Kenneth A. Kenyon, Assistant Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C. It reads:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, August 21, 1950.

HON. BOYD TACKETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TACKETT: We have received your letter of August 14 and the attached com-

munication from your constituent, Mrs. J. M. Damon, inquiring about the recent decline in the gold stock of the United States.

The decline in the United States gold stock, which has been taking place during the past year, is not cause for alarm. On the contrary, it is an indication of the readjustment which is taking place in the monetary reserves of foreign countries. The United States has recently been selling gold for dollars to foreign countries which are in the process of rebuilding their reserves. Monetary reserves (in gold and foreign currencies) are maintained by all countries that engage in international trade. Their functions are similar to the functions of balances in individual checking accounts: (1) They facilitate the settlement of debts incurred in the normal exchange of goods between different countries and (2) they provide a reserve of funds which can be drawn upon in case of emergency.

During the first few years after the war, many foreign countries had to sell large amounts of gold from their reserves in order to obtain dollars with which to buy urgently needed goods in the United States. Consequently, between the end of 1945 and August 1949, over 4½ billion dollars (\$4,543,000,000) worth of gold was added to our gold stock. By selling so much gold to us, many foreign countries reduced their stocks of gold to dangerously low levels; they had little left with which to carry on trade with us and to meet unforeseen emergency situations.

During the past year, however, as a result of increased production and currency devaluations, many countries succeeded in increasing their sales of goods to the United States. Some of these countries are using a portion of their dollar earnings to buy back from us some of the gold that was sold during the postwar period of reconstruction.

The amounts involved in these recent purchases by foreign countries are small relative to our total gold stock, which remains well above the legal-reserve requirements stipulated by Congress. Furthermore, the United States stock of gold represents about 70 percent of total reported world gold reserves (outside of the Soviet Union).

We trust that this information will serve to answer the questions raised by your constituent, whose letter to you is returned herewith.

Very truly yours,
KENNETH A. KENYON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Was that gold sold at \$35 an ounce?

Mr. TACKETT. I have just given the information that I received from the Federal Reserve System. I do not know, of course, what the gold was sold for or what we paid for it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does the gentleman know whether any of those foreign countries have turned around and resold the gold for dollars at about \$57 an ounce and made a 60-percent profit on the turn-over?

Mr. TACKETT. Of course, I do not know whether or not they are making a profit on the gold or whether we made a profit when we bought the gold.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman mentioned the question of a reserve; did he say coal or gold?

Mr. TACKETT. Gold.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Was there any statement attached to that letter from the

Treasury stating the countries that received the gold?

Mr. TACKETT. No; there is not.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would be very much interested in knowing who got it.

Mr. TACKETT. I am sure that the gentleman or anyone else can get this information by writing to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States or the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is one other way, sir, in which it can be acquired. If we furnish dollars or dollar equivalents through contributions to ECA or otherwise and they use that same contribution of our money to buy our gold stocks; can they not do it that way, too?

Mr. TACKETT. I am sure that they could.

Mr. MASON. They have been.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes, that could have happened—I don't know whether any of the gold was so acquired by foreign countries from our reserve.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word simply for the purpose of saying that we are reaching the end of the bill. We have three more titles to read. I understand there are two or three amendments to be offered. I am sure that if we confine our remarks to the pending bill, it would expedite consideration of the remaining sections and we will make much better time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General Counsel; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$8,300,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060).

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 34, line 3, strike out "\$8,300,000" and insert "\$8,000,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is proposed in order to cut the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board from the figure set forth in the bill of \$8,300,000 to \$8,000,000, resulting in a saving of \$300,000.

The justification for this is as follows: If you will look at the schedule in back of the bill it appears there that the Labor Board has been cut from its last year's appropriation, but if you will look on

page 20 of the report you will find that although there is an apparent cut the fact is the rental of the National Labor Relations Board has been transferred from that Board to the General Services Administration which saves them \$353,000 a year. The net result is that this Board's personnel requirements has increased by nearly \$100,000 rather than the reduction which appears in the schedule in back of the report.

In addition to that fact, Mr. Chairman, an incident has occurred since this report was made which further justifies the cut in the personnel of the National Labor Relations Board. You will recall that in the last war we had what was known as the War Labor Board. That Board at that time settled a great many of the labor disputes. That Board was given jurisdiction by Executive order. Now, there has been going on a dispute between industry and labor in the last few weeks and this morning's paper announces that this new War Labor Board which has been created by Executive order will during this emergency have jurisdiction over labor disputes. So that since this bill was reported much of the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board has been taken away by this Executive order.

The history of the situation is that in the last war when the War Labor Board was set up and began to take jurisdiction over labor disputes, the work of the National Labor Relations Board in dispute cases, which is the larger proportion of their business, was tremendously reduced, so that there is no occasion in the world why they should have an increase in view of the recent decision which occurred only this morning giving to the War Labor Board the power to settle labor disputes during the present emergency.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman by what he has just said of the new War Labor Board is approving the assumption of such activities by the Board? As far as I am concerned, I would rather we proceed under the laws we have and the procedures that have been created by the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think it is a very sad commentary on the Congress and on the country when an act of Congress by which we undertake to settle labor disputes or to settle any other proposition is passed by the Congress and becomes the law of the land, and the President of the United States undertakes to do something else about it by Executive order. And I make that statement without respect to who may be President of the United States. This Congress is supposed to make the laws and not the Executive.

I protested during the last war against this extra jurisdiction being assumed by the executive department to settle labor disputes when we had a labor act to do it with, and I protest again, but the protest is not going to do you any good. The fact is that during this present emergency labor disputes are going

to be handled in very large measure by the executive department under this new War Labor Board and the work of the National Labor Relations Board, which was set up by the Congress, is going to be diminished.

Now, I do not want to get off the track. What I am trying to do is to save the taxpayers of the United States \$300,000 of unnecessary expenditures. I am asking the House to vote to sustain this amendment and cut that appropriation back to the point of what may be needed.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman's argument is well taken on the basis of his assumption. However, might I suggest in respect to his references to the responsibility of the Congress, that possibly the Congress ought to look into the matter that is presently developing and see just what the Congress might do about it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from Indiana knows that he will have no more ardent advocate of that program than the present speaker now addressing you. I shall be glad to join with the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted during the Eightieth Congress under Republican control. That is one of the things that they take credit for during their regime when they had control of both the House and the Senate. On a personal basis I bitterly opposed the passage of that act. I am still opposed to it, and I remember very well when the act was passed and when the first request for an appropriation came before this subcommittee some 3 or 4 years ago. They did not have anything to justify their appropriation at all under the new act, but we gave them every dime they asked for. I remember the argument used then was "this is our baby and we have to give them every dime they ask for because we do not want to be blamed for this act if we do not give them enough to operate with." I went along with the majority at that time, who were Republicans, and because of wanting to be fair in this entire proceeding I have never willfully, in one way or another, attempted to cut this appropriation just because I was against the enactment of this legislation. As a consequence, for the past 3 years since I have been Chairman of this subcommittee we have not purposely cut it one dime just because some of us had been opposed to and voted against the enactment of this act when it was passed 4 years ago. On the contrary we have gone along with them.

They came before us and they gave us the workloads they are working under; they gave us the backlog of the number of cases they are behind, and they established such a case that we have practically given them every dime they have asked for in order to carry out the provisions of that act. They testified this year that in 1951 the estimated cases to be processed were 22,950. In 1952 they show an increase up to 23,600. On the record of case intake for the fiscal year 1950 it was 21,632 and 1951 it is 22,950. So, all the figures that they have given us show that their increase in workload is going up year after year, and that is why we did not cut them as much as we have some other agencies, although we did cut them \$282,500 this year to bring them in line so that they could operate on the fiscal year 1951 basis. I just wanted to make this one thing clear to you, even though the majority of this subcommittee has been against that act since it was enacted, we have never deliberately attempted to slice one dollar from it, so that we could never be blamed. The act is on the books. It was an act of Congress. It was put on by a majority vote of the Eightieth Congress, and they should have the money to operate with, and we have been fair with them in their appropriation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. NELSON. Can the gentleman tell me where this new board created by Executive order will get its money to operate?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot tell the gentleman that. We have nothing to do with it. It is not in this bill. There is nothing in this bill that pertains to that board at all. We have absolutely nothing to do with it. It will come under some defense appropriations subcommittee in the House, I would assume.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Would this War Labor Board that has been created handle the rank-and-file cases of the type that are now before the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is something I do not know. This new Board has just been established. I do not know what its duties are. I do not know whether they are going to get money to function with or not. I do not know whether they are going to need money. I do not know whether they are going to be paid or not. That is something I do not know. I do not think the Congress knows. It has not been before our committee, and I do not believe it has been before any other committee on appropriations, to my knowledge; so I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. So cutting the appropriation then would be just taking a shot in the dark and hoping there would be an agency now set up that would take over the work that is being done by the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot give the gentleman an answer to that at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Cox) there were—ayes 116, noes 60.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said acts as may be specifically authorized annually in appropriation acts, there is hereby appropriated for crediting monthly to the railroad retirement account for the fiscal year 1952, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to the amount covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during each such fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (26 U. S. C. 1500-1538): *Provided*, That the appropriation made herein for the fiscal year 1952 shall be adjusted by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, in such manner as may be necessary to insure that the railroad retirement account shall be credited for an amount equal to the amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) prior to July 1, 1951, under said Railroad Retirement Tax Act and under the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937, as amended, less (1) amounts credited as premiums to the railroad retirement account (excluding \$334,429,100 heretofore appropriated for military service credits) and (2) amounts properly chargeable as administrative expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board, prior to July 1, 1951.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 36, the proviso beginning after the colon on line 4 and going down to the period on line 16. This is legislation on an appropriation bill. Obviously, this goes beyond the scope of the bill and beyond the appropriation provisions of the bill. It is similar in nature to the language to which I made objection last year at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania define the specific language in the bill to which he raises the point of order?

Mr. FLOOD. The point of order is to the legislative intent and the legislative provision of the entire proviso.

As I read this, I construe in effect as amounting to a repealer of existing legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand that the gentleman makes a point of order only to the language on page 36 beginning at line 4, that is under the proviso?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And ending on line 16?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Would not the point of order raised by the gentleman go to the entire paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania so made the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD. There is no reason for that. My purpose is served since the point of order has been conceded, and I make it only to the proviso.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Do I understand that the point of order has been made only with respect to the language commencing on line 14 of page 36 and continuing to the end of line 16?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the way the Chair understands the point of order made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WOLVERTON. It is my understanding that the point of order goes to the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to make such a point of order?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. CROSSER. The point of order goes to the entire paragraph.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania a moment ago if his point of order was to the proviso only and I understand the gentleman to say that it was.

Mr. FLOOD. That was true. That was the point of order I made, but I have no objection to making a subsequent point of order this time to make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, so that there may be no misunderstanding about the situation, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York concede the point of order to the entire paragraph?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph, in view of the discussion which has just taken place.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and offer an amendment, which I sent to the clerk's desk.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, where does the point of order now end? Does it end on line 16? I am confused. I do not know where the language ends to which the point of order is made. Does it end on line 16 or does it end on line 24 of page 36?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order now takes in the entire paragraph beginning on page 35 and ending at line 16, page 36, as follows:

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death

benefits in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said acts as may be specifically authorized annually in appropriation acts, there is hereby appropriated for crediting monthly to the railroad retirement account for the fiscal year 1952, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to the amount covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during each such fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (26 U. S. C. 1500-1538): *Provided*, That the appropriation made herein for the fiscal year 1952 shall be adjusted by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, in such manner as may be necessary to insure that the railroad retirement account shall be credited for an amount equal to the amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) prior to July 1, 1951, under said Railroad Retirement Tax Act and under the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937, as amended, less (1) amounts credited as premiums to the railroad retirement account (excluding \$334,429,100 heretofore appropriated for military service credits) and (2) amounts properly chargeable as administrative expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board, prior to July 1, 1951.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. And the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGRATH: On page 35, after line 14, insert the following:

"Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits, in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said acts as specifically provided for under this title, for crediting to the railroad retirement account, an amount equal to amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during the current fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (26 U. S. C. 1500-1538)."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, reducing this proposed amendment to its simplest terms, it is simply a method by which we hope to save \$4,500,000 of the taxpayers' money. Heretofore the procedure had been that at the beginning of the fiscal year they would approximate the amount which would be collected in taxes and then appropriate that amount. The new language provides that the taxes, as they are collected, will be turned over from the Treasury of the United States to the Railroad Retirement Board for immediate investment and for the payment of necessary benefits. The present system has been somewhat of a guess; a sort of put-and-take proposition, as we stated in the committee report. The proposed language changes it to monthly payments as the taxes are collected, the same as we have in our social-security program. The purpose of this would be to save the taxpayers the interest on the amount, and to set this up on a sound basis, and it means a saving of \$4,500,000.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CROSSER. The fact is you are changing the law as it now exists in that respect.

Mr. McGRATH. No. I will say to the gentleman that is not the fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CROSSER offers the following amendment in substitution for the amendment offered by Mr. McGRATH, line 15 on page 35:

"Railroad retirement account: For an amount sufficient as an annual premium for the payments required under the Railroad Retirement Acts of August 29, 1935, and June 24, 1937, and authorized to be appropriated to the railroad retirement account established under section 15 (a) of the latter act, \$562,534,409: *Provided*, That such total amount shall be available until expended for making payments required under said retirement acts, and the amount not required for current payments shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order against this substitute amendment that this places additional duties upon the Secretary of the Treasury, and I respectfully call the attention of the chairman to the language of the proposed amendment that the current payment shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] desire to be heard?

Mr. CROSSER. I simply deny the fact. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Ohio cite the law giving the Secretary of the Treasury authority referred to?

The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] seems to place additional duties upon the Secretary of the Treasury not contemplated by law and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to try to understand, if I can, the language offered by the gentleman from New York on behalf of the committee, and just what it would do. I want to know if this is not in fact the same as the other amendment just deleted by point of order.

As I understand, the committee in presenting the language included in the bill attempted to change the method provided in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, whereby funds would be covered into the Treasury on a monthly basis instead of annual basis. Is that true?

Mr. McGRATH. With the accent on "the annual basis."

Mr. HARRIS. Now, I understand the language was subject to a point of order and stricken out. Then the gentleman offers this amendment as a substitute. I have not had an opportunity to read it.

I would like to ask if the gentleman's amendment he has offered as a substitute does not do the same thing that the committee language would have done. I would like to understand it. I may be in accord with what the gentleman offers, but I am not sure that I understand what he wants to do.

Mr. McGRATH. We do not go beyond the fiscal year of 1952.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand, then, that the gentleman or his committee has had information from the Treasury Department that after this fiscal year, under the administration of this program they intend to carry out the policy as the committee has outlined in its report?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes; I would say that the answer to the gentleman's question is in the affirmative. The committee has been advised by the Budget Bureau that an arrangement has been worked out with the Treasury to put into effect a new system of tax collection. Beginning with the fiscal year 1952 they will collect taxes monthly instead of quarterly and pay those funds over to the trust fund on a monthly basis. In that way the fund will have the money available quickly for investment and interest-earning purposes.

Mr. HARRIS. I personally would not have any objection to a program under a plan deemed most advisable. I am sure the gentleman understands that in the course of the passage by this Congress of the Railroad Retirement Act that that was discussed. The first act went to the Supreme Court of the United States. Out of that experience the act of 1937 was passed.

I want to understand clearly that any action taken by this committee here today would not in any way affect the decision of the Supreme Court and the plan which provided and which is authorized by that act. Can the gentleman give us that assurance?

Mr. McGRATH. I can say to you absolutely I give you that assurance.

Mr. HARRIS. And if it appears after further consideration that the language in this substitute might in some way seriously affect this program would the gentleman assure us that in the course of the progress of this legislation, or in conference the committee will accept and assist on such clarification as is found advisable and necessary?

Mr. McGRATH. I can assure the gentleman, for whom I have the highest regard, for I consider him one of the most capable Members of the House, that we will consult him in an effort to work it out.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman from New York. He understands as I do that this is a highly important matter and very, very technical. You cannot change the lan-

guage of this law without affecting the purposes and intentions of the Railroad Retirement Act.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield; and I would like to say in yielding to the gentleman from New Jersey that he was here and on the committee at the time this legislation was passed and is one Member of this House who knows as much about it as anyone else.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I hardly wish to qualify to that extent. But it is my opinion that this particular substitute that was offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is in entire accord with the Retirement Act, and that the wording of the closing sentence of his amendment, reading as follows: "shall be invested by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937," does not change or add to the duties of the Secretary under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and is consequently in order.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to say to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey that the Chair has already sustained the point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. CROSSER].

What I was trying to do was to clarify the intentions and understand the language presented by the committee here in reference to this matter. I certainly do not think it should be cut out entirely, but I think we should clearly understand just what the language the gentleman proposes will do.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am of the opinion that it will do what was originally intended by the committee when it put the provision in the original bill and against which the point of order was raised and sustained. In order that there may be a complete understanding of this matter, I wish to bring to the attention of the committee that the appropriation language in the bill, H. R. 3709, beginning in line 15 on page 35 of the bill and continuing through line 16 on page 36, makes a substantive change in the provisions in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act which authorizes appropriations to the railroad retirement account. This section reads as follows:

Sec. 15. (a) There is hereby created an account in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the railroad retirement account. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the account for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, as an annual premium, an amount sufficient, with a reasonable margin for contingencies, to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits in accordance with the provisions of this act and the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935. Such amount shall be based on such tables of mortality as the Railroad Retirement Board shall from time to time adopt, and on an interest rate of 3 percent per annum compounded annually. The Railroad Retirement Board shall submit annually to the Bureau of the Budget an estimate of the appropriation to be made to the account.

There is nothing in this section which makes appropriations to the railroad retirement account conditioned upon amounts collected in taxes for the maintenance of the railroad retirement system nor which authorizes in effect a series of monthly appropriations determined by the monthly collections. On the contrary, it authorizes only a single annual appropriation in a definite amount to be determined in accordance with the authorization.

By way of comparison, I direct your attention to section 10 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, which reads in pertinent part as follows:

Sec. 10. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall maintain in the unemployment trust fund established pursuant to section 904 of the Social Security Act an account to be known as the railroad unemployment insurance account. This account shall consist of (1) such part of all contributions collected pursuant to section 8 of this act as is in excess of 0.2 percent of the total compensation on which such contributions are based, together with all interest collected pursuant to section 8 (g) of this act.

The appropriation language in that act does provide that, except for the portion to be deposited in an administration fund, all the contributions collected for the maintenance of the unemployment insurance system shall be deposited in the railroad unemployment insurance account.

The difference between the appropriation language in the two acts leaves no room for doubt that Congress very deliberately authorized different methods of appropriation for the two systems. No one could say reasonably that the appropriation language in the two acts is even similar—that the appropriation language in section 10 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act could be substituted for the appropriation language in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act. Yet this, in substance, is what the bill H. R. 3709 proposes to do. Thus, the language in the bill would make the amount appropriated to the railroad retirement account and the time the appropriation becomes effective conditioned upon the amount and timing of collections under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act similar to the provision in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. The language in the bill, though it gives lip service to the words "annual premium," makes no reference to section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act, which is the statutory authority for the appropriation to the railroad retirement account.

That Congress provided different methods for the making of appropriations under the two acts may be further seen from section 16 of the Railroad Retirement Act, which provides as follows:

Sec. 16. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to provide for the expenses of the Board in administering the provisions of this act and the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935.

And from section 11 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act

which provides in pertinent part as follows:

Sec. 11. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund. This fund shall consist of (1) such part of all contributions collected pursuant to section 8 of this act as equals 0.2 percent of the total compensation on which such contributions are based.

The failure of any reference in section 16 of the Railroad Retirement Act to taxes collected for the maintenance of the railroad retirement system, and the specific reference to contributions in section 11 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is further proof of congressional intent to distinguish between the methods of appropriation for the two acts.

In practice the amounts appropriated to the railroad retirement account are so adjusted from year to year as to result in appropriations of no more than is actually collected in taxes. But the method of appropriation established in section 15 (a) of the Retirement Act was deliberately adopted for an important purpose. When it was enacted it was considered important to the constitutional basis of the legislation that this method be followed. If the validity of that consideration is now to be questioned and a different authorization for appropriations proposed, such a step cannot properly be considered here until the legislative committee responsible for railroad retirement legislation gives the matter its consideration.

The question here is solely whether the Appropriations Committee of the House can take upon itself the authority to override and change the method established by Congress for making appropriations to the railroad retirement account; whether the Appropriations Committee of the House can override the practice followed for the past 9 years by appropriation committees, including this very Appropriations Committee, in making appropriations to the railroads retirement account in accordance with the provisions of section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act.

We cannot properly here debate the wisdom or the propriety of the present provision in the Railroad Retirement Act with regard to appropriations to the railroad retirement account. I am only arguing for a proper and orderly procedure in this respect. If the Appropriations Committee is convinced that the provisions in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act should be changed, the proper form for a discussion of this question is the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which was responsible for the enactment of the original provision in 1937 and before which all persons having an interest in the issue can be afforded an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. HARRIS. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I have some very serious suspicions on it myself. We should not legislate on these appropriation bills. This is too technical and if any changes are made in the basic law it should be after full hearings by

our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I have the honor to serve and which has legislative jurisdiction of this subject. It affects several hundred thousand railroad employees. It means too much to them and the industry to adopt basic changes in the law without knowing the effects.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 119, noes 5.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$3,047,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas. On page 37, line 14, strike out "\$3,047,000" and insert "\$2,949,700."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am submitting applies to one agency only. If approved, it will reduce the appropriation by \$97,300. It will mean the agency will still have the same amount it had last year. This agency did ask for still more money, but the committee granted the increase indicated in the bill. Now, take a brief look. This agency, comparatively small in size, asked for \$3,247,000 for salaries and expenses for 404 people, some of them only part-time employees. That is an over-all average for all employees of \$8,000 per year. This is counting stenographers, clerks, and others at comparatively lower salaries. This would indicate some of them are doing pretty well in the way of salaries. I remind you the request indicates is for part-time assistance. This part-time assistance is to be paid on the basis of \$75 per day and expenses. The agency is allowed to go out and employ whom it chooses and pay as much as \$75 per day without consideration of civil-service requirements.

Neither the bill nor the report nor the hearings indicate how much of this fund of more than \$3,000,000 is to be spent on the \$75-a-day employees. Nothing is said about the required qualifications of these employees. The bill says, in substance, you propose to spend more than \$3,000,000 for salaries and expenses of officers, employees, temporary employees that include "arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations." The hearings indicate the employment of approximately 400 people. There is an additional item of \$50,000 for office expense in the District of Columbia. Incidentally, it may be said this expenditure is in support of labor.

Whether that be correct or not, I cannot imagine the rank and file of labor wanting to increase an item that will pay any agency employees an average of more than \$8,000 per year, many of them working only part time. Nor for paying a lot of additional persons I have described more than \$50 per day and expenses for part-time service.

My amendment is a mild one. It just says the agency cannot expend more than last year. But, if you approve it, there will be a savings of \$97,300 to the taxpayers of this country. Even then you are still being pretty liberal with this agency.

This amendment should be approved. Following action on the pending amendment, if I may have the attention of the Chair, I shall offer a further amendment which will reduce the maximum of \$75 a day proposed in this bill back to \$50 a day.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said about the fine manner in which the affairs of this agency have been administered by its present Administrator, Mr. Ching. From what I have heard concerning Mr. Ching, he is one of the most industrious and able men at the head of any of our agencies. He is highly respected by those who know him personally. I do think, however, that if permitted to select men for these higher paid positions—without pressure or influence of any kind—he can do a still better job. If he were allowed to select all of these appointees without political influence of any kind, it would be helpful to his agency as well as to those whom the agency serves.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to cripple the functions of any needed service. But here is a place where an agency, in view of the condition of the Federal Treasury, and the mounting cost of government ought to be willing to cut any unnecessary expenses, work just a little harder and save a little money for needed expenditures for the defense of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat a statement I have made on the floor of this House I have made many times before. The expenditures for each and every civilian agency should be made on the basis of absolute need, and in the light of the tremendous tax load charged against the people of this country.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, since the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has been headed by Cyrus Ching, who I believe has the respect of most Members of Congress and of the people of the country, the committee has found that he has been one of the most conservative administrators of any agency that has appeared before it. He has asked for an increase this year of \$297,000. The committee cut that in-

crease asked for by \$200,000, thinking that much was all that could be imposed. We placed in the record how many employees he had in 1946, 1950, 1951, and 1952. In 1946 they had 488 employees; in 1950, 351; in 1951, 364. He asked for 406 employees, but with the money we allowed in the committee bill they will probably not have over 375 employees, which is 113 less than they had in 1946. We think he has been doing a good job with the personnel he has had, but I think we must remember this one pertinent thing, and I think it should be remembered by everyone, that in times of an emergency there is always a great demand by the public to avoid strikes and maintain production. A principal purpose of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is to prevent strikes, and they have prevented many times more strikes than have occurred in the past 2 or 3 years because of the leadership of Cyrus Ching and the type of personnel he has working under him. We think he is one of the ablest administrators we have in any Federal agency. Because of the experience in the last war when more men were needed in order to prevent strikes before they occur, we allowed him a small increase this year of \$97,000 with the hope that he could prevent strikes that might otherwise take place in the next fiscal year. Now, that is the kind of a record he has and that is the record that he is living under and that is the record that he is known by. I do not believe there is a Member of the Congress that will dispute the statement that I have just made. We all have a great deal of confidence in him. We feel he has a good organization. We believe that he needs this mere handful of additional personnel allowed under the \$97,000, and we think it will pay off in the end by giving him the implements to do the work with. He has the know-how, he has the organization, and we are convinced he can do a good job if we give him the implements to work with. That was our main reason for giving him the small increase, because of the emergency we are in at the present time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We all agree that Chairman Ching is a great man. Does not the gentleman think that with the over-all picture, when you are allowing over \$8,000 a year for the whole 400 and some odd people, that that is pretty fair, liberal, and average payment for employees in an agency? I realize that it is just as important and more important than a good many others, but even so, does not the gentleman feel that he is pretty liberal even cutting the figure back this small amount of \$90,000?

Mr. FOGARTY. We cut them \$200,000 and we went into this thing very thoroughly. There was no disposition on the part of the committee to increase anywhere as we have shown. We have cut practically everywhere, and if it was within the power of the committee, if we thought in good conscience that this could have been cut more and it would

not hurt his organization as it is functioning at the present time, we certainly would have cut it more. It was based on bare facts that he gave and the experience that we had during the last emergency that we allowed this small increase.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Just that much more than you allowed last year.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, because of the emergency we are in. The Korean situation was not with us when we had this bill up a year ago. Because of the vast defense production program, we think it is more essential now to give them that additional personnel than it was a year ago. That is the only reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: Page 37, line 11, strike out "\$75" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I mentioned a few minutes ago.

This amendment reduces the maximum of payment under this bill from \$75 per day to \$50 per day. If you will refer to page 37 of the bill, the first paragraph refers to salaries and expenses, and then it states that the appropriation for \$3,047,000 includes "temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators," and so forth, at rates "not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings" and so forth. In other words, \$75 per day and expenses. All authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946.

Now, I call your attention to section 13, Public Law 600, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which states:

The head of any department, when authorized in an appropriation or other act, may procure temporary (not in excess of 1 year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil-service and classification laws—

Then in parentheses it says—

but as to agencies subject to the Classification Act at rates not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest rate payable under the Classification Act—

Note this—

unless other rates are specifically provided in the appropriation.

So in line with that clause allowed in an appropriation bill and hike that rate up to \$75.

The Comptroller General has submitted an opinion that says in substance that if you follow this section of the law, leaving out what I call the "escape" clause, the amount you would be permitted to pay on the per diem basis would be \$42.42 per day, a little less than \$50 per day.

It will be argued that the Administrator may not be able to secure competent people for this so-called part-time work at \$50 per day and expenses. My first

answer is that according I have received, he has not been required to do that thus far. I call your attention to the fact there is no limit to the length of time during which these special people may be employed. More than that, nothing is said concerning qualification requirements. Nothing is said in the bill or the report as to the number that may be employed. Suppose administration officials insist on certain persons being appointed, what is the Administrator going to do about it. There should be a limitation on the number to be appointed under this provision of the bill. I am informed an amendment to do that now will be ruled out as not being germane. The committee should have written some such provision in the bill.

I respect the statement of the chairman of this committee that the chairman of this agency is one of the best known, and among those who are most respected in our agencies, but it seems to me you are going a little far when you bring in an appropriation bill and say that we are going to pay a group of people, I do not know how many, \$75 per day, then go still further and put no limitation in this bill. It does not say how many you are going to hire at \$75 a day or \$60 a day or \$50 a day; not at all. You open the gate. Later we will have legislation asking that the amount be fixed at \$100 per day. Again I call attention there are no qualification requirements in the bill. Not at all. As I said a little while ago, there is not even anything in the testimony submitted in the hearings to say what the qualifications may be.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that when the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service approved legislation permitting the President to break the ceiling on Federal salaries, the number of persons in each category and salary allowed was fixed in the legislation. Has any member of the committee computed the amount an employee would draw at \$75 per day if he worked for a year? He could work 5 days a week, take 2 days off, and make \$18,750 and his expenses.

Mr. Chairman, this committee, and the membership of this House, would, if they knew the amounts expended, be interested in the cost of the services of engineers hired on a contract basis in advisory capacity to some of our agencies. I am not right here criticizing the service, but the amount expended runs in rather high figures.

Again I want to pay my high regard and respect to the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. He has made a good presentation of this legislation to the committee. He has been eminently fair, even though we may disagree. I hope the committee will support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I anticipated when this appropriation bill came up in which the agencies of labor are quite considerably involved, that again the labor movement would be the whipping-boy. The last vote was an indication to me which I simply could not let pass without presenting to the House some of the involvement. So far as Mr. Ching is concerned, I am not always in agreement with him, because to me he is quite conservative. As a matter of fact he is a little too conservative so far as people are concerned for whom he has tried to mediate fair and equitable agreements. But this is what has happened in this field. During the Eightieth Congress in my city where the Conciliation and Mediation agency is located, you have three field men. As a result of the cut in the budget of the Mediation and Conciliation Service, it meant the laying off of two of the field men. With about 1,500 separate labor unions in the State of Minnesota whose contracts come up every year there has been in the House of Representatives and in every other legislative body an appeal that those labor unions have a little patience in their attempt and in their desire to arrive at a settlement without a wage dispute or a labor dispute.

For the past 3 years I have been beset by the labor unions in the State of Minnesota for some relief in their efforts to get a field man from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to sit in and try to iron out the differences between management and labor. In the office of Mr. Carlgren in Minneapolis I venture to say that as of this date there are over 400 requests for mediation between employers and the labor unions awaiting action. I think we in Washington sympathized very much with the railway trainmen who recently had a dispute here which all of us felt was a rather desperate situation, but after waiting 2 years patience ceases to be a virtue, and unless there is machinery to process these fights, justice will not be done. I hope this cut will not pass and that the representative of the Federal Mediation Board be preserved so that we can process some of these labor disputes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how this Congress can justify increasing this rate to \$75 a day. If we are for anything we are in favor of stabilizing these prices and preventing further advances in the price level. That means no further advances in wages and salaries. I say, if we are for anything we are in favor of stabilizing these prices.

Take the work days in a year and multiply them by 50, and you will find that it is a little more salary than you get as a Member of Congress. If you put it up to \$75 a day, from a straight dollar standpoint it seems to me a great many Members of Congress would be seeking

to be released from their present jobs and going out and taking some of this per diem gravy. I wish someone would get up here and justify this increase in pay that is proposed here.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. WIER. I will tell you what is happening all over the country. Major industry all over this country has put on their own personnel labor directors. Where do they get them?

Mr. CRAWFORD. What does that have to do with stabilizing the price level?

Mr. WIER. It has this to do with it—

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now I do not yield any further. That is all I have time for. I asked a question and you started talking about major industry. You can condemn one side or the other until you have the wage level up to \$50 an hour, and the price of a loaf of bread up to \$6 a loaf. You cannot justify your argument in favor of stabilizing wages and then sit here every chance you get and vote to increase wages. Let us support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and hold this rate to \$50 per day at the present time, and I will wager the Administrator, Mr. Ching, can get all the good people he needs. There is no question about that in my mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] knows whether Mr. Ching can get these men or not. For 3 or 4 years he has been telling the committee he cannot get them, and if there is anybody who knows whether he can get them or not, that one man is Mr. Ching.

I think we should realize this: Emergency boards appointed by the President in railroad disputes are paid \$100 a day per member. There are arbitrators in this country who are getting more than \$100 a day. In the item we just passed, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, they give \$75 a day to referees in deadlocked cases.

It has been testified by Mr. Ching that they are taken away from a business of some kind, or they have judges in some cases who are experts in some particular field. You cannot send a carpenter in to settle a nation-wide steel strike. They must have someone who is of a high type and high caliber. If you do not have that type of man you cannot expect the results you are after. You cannot send an unqualified man in to do a real man's job in settling a Nation-wide dispute.

The fact is this was raised from \$50 to \$75 a year or so ago. It is not, as someone mentioned, that we are raising it this year for the first time. Mr. Ching testified before this committee previously that it was impossible for him to get men. The rate at that time was \$35 a day. He could not get men to sit on these boards who were qualified, in his judgment, to do the job of mediating

and conciliating these particular disputes on a nation-wide basis.

During the hearings I said, "This year these people get \$75." Mr. Ching said, "Yes."

We had some language in the bill for 1951 to pay the men \$75 a day, but up until the time this hearing was held not one dime was spent for this particular kind of arbitration. It is put in there for a purpose. When he gets into a stalemate on a Nation-wide basis, when he has to take men away from business or a man sitting on the supreme court in some State, who has had experience in settling these particular disputes, that is the man he reaches for and gets, because he is the most competent man, in his opinion, to handle and settle that dispute. That is the only reason we have it in there, not because of anything the committee wants to do, but because of the evidence that was presented to us which indicated that it was the thing to do. It is merely standby authority to be used only when it is really needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 39, after line 7, add a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or

propaganda purposes not heretofore authorized by the Congress."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to prevent as far as possible the spending of unreasonable amounts for propaganda and publicity purposes. It in no way affects the amount as authorized in this bill. The two agencies affected are Labor and Federal Security.

We know that as far as Mr. Ewing is concerned he is constantly propagandizing the country on socialized medicine.

A look at an analysis or a breakdown of the schedule shows that for Labor, item No. 6, Printing and reproduction, we have the amount of \$532,151. Just what that covers I have not been able to discover, at least members of the committee on our side of the aisle have not been able to learn specifically what is covered.

Under social security we give to Mr. Ewing the grand sum of \$2,185,615 for printing and reproduction. We have some idea, I believe, we know what some of this money will go for. I want to call attention to the testimony that was developed in the committee on the activities of Mr. Ewing, and at this point I would like to say to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], that I believe he and his subcommittee have been tough on the social-security agency, they have done a fine job but I think we can be still more tough on Mr. Ewing. I would like to read a colloquy between the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK], of the committee, and Mr. Ewing from page 346 of the hearings for the Federal Security Agency:

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Ewing, you stated a few minutes ago that you made a good many speeches and had requests to make lots of speeches.

Mr. EWING. Yes.

Mr. HEDRICK. I would like to inquire how many speeches you made during the calendar year of 1950 advocating compulsory health insurance.

Mr. EWING. I would have to check that.

Mr. HEDRICK. About how many?

Mr. EWING. I would be afraid to guess. I think I furnished the figures for 1949 to the Buchanan committee, but I have never made it up for this.

Mr. HEDRICK. What about 1949?

Mr. EWING. I believe it is here. However, I do not think they break it down as to subject matter. I have that broken down someplace.

This information was apparently submitted later:

A total of 18 speeches dealing in whole or in part with health insurance were delivered during the calendar year 1949 by the Federal Security Administrator, or one of his immediate assistants keeping a speaking engagement which he was unable to fill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think I can add to the gentleman's statement by saying that in the educational field much propaganda has come out of that office advocating the transition from a national sovereignty to a one-world government. I know that because the superintendent of public instruction in my State received part of this material.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Would not the effect of the gentleman's amendment in using the word "propaganda" jeopardize publication by the Children's Bureau of pamphlets pertaining to the training and growth of children? The Children's Bureau put out a number of pamphlets on the subject of children, including the subject of infant care and progressively the subjects are dealt with as the ages of the children advance. Would not the gentleman believe that using the term "propaganda" without attempting to limit it to the health-insurance program would jeopardize the entire program of the National Security Agency and should not the gentleman's amendment more properly be addressed to propaganda concerning the health-insurance program?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would not agree with the gentleman. It seems to me that we can well distinguish between what is propaganda and what is educational matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think there is a very marked distinction. The gentleman's amendment runs only to matters which have not had the support or the approval of the Congress. The matter of getting out booklets has always had the approval of Congress through action of the committee on which the gentleman serves.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. In the gentleman's opening statement he made reference to two agencies that were getting out considerable printed matter and propaganda. Let us get back to the Labor Department. Has the gentleman at any time witnessed any material coming out of the Labor Department which he would term propaganda?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, I think that is obvious.

Mr. WIER. Let us talk about propaganda now.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is propaganda.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. While we are talking about Oscar Ewing, I asked for a breakdown from Mr. Ewing when we had the hearings on the travel expenses of not

only himself but the other members of his administrative staff, which I shall include in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by merely pointing out that this is a prohibition which affects those agencies that have not already been set up and their present programs. It does, however, prohibit the extension of propaganda and publicity any further. I intend in future appropriation bills to attempt to have inserted this same provision because I believe that the American people are fed up with political and propaganda handouts from the Federal Government. This is an abuse that strikes directly at our free institutions. The time to stop the practice is now.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know the membership of the committee will be interested to know some of the traveling expenses that have been incurred in the Federal Security Agency.

May I give this information to the committee at this time:

Mr. Ewing has spent a total of \$3,398.22; Mr. Thurston, \$807.31; Mr. Bernstein, \$2,607.96; Anna Hedgeman, \$2,384.15; Mary Switzer, \$1,148; Theodore Hayes, \$236.10; Jewell Swoford, \$1,211.96; and Elizabeth Kavary, \$1,963.94; making a total of \$13,758.48.

There are other totals to be added, such as administrative planning, budget division, personnel division, and service operations amounting to \$4,465.98, and some information that went along with those speeches amounting to \$863.84, making a grand total of \$19,088.30.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I hope that all future appropriation bills will contain this provision. It seems to me that if we are to save the taxpayers money the one place we can do it is to place a limitation on the propaganda machine of the Federal Government. I do not have the recent figures of the publicity and propaganda activities of the Government. The latest that are available are 1946. But, the Budget Bureau shows that in 1946 the total expenditures in the Executive branch for publicity and propaganda amounted to \$75,000,000. That probably was raised, from the information I have been able to get from the various departments, amounting to an increase in appropriations of something over \$100,000,000 as of today.

Back in 1946 there were 45,000 Federal employees engaged in information and publicity and propaganda activities of the Federal Government where you could put your finger on them, but the greater bulk of the publicity and propaganda that goes on within the executive departments of our Government is not conducted by those who are listed as information specialists but those who are drawing salaries under some other heading and going out to organize their influence on the Congress throughout the country. In 1946 it was \$75,000,000; today it is probably \$100,000,000, but

just 10 years ago the figure for publicity and propaganda in the United States was \$27,770,000; or, in other words, there has been an increase over the past 10 years of over three hundredfold in the amount of the taxpayers' money that is being used for that purpose.

Let me just call your attention to a few of the things that are done with taxpayers' money to bring that about. In the Federal Security Agency, in their attempt to propagandize for socialized medicine, they set up teams to send throughout the country to organize local groups and then get those local groups to put the heat on the Congress. One of the bulletins and one of the pamphlets taken from the files of the Federal Security Agency to be used by their training officers set out to organize these meetings show the following: These are the topics that the training officers have to use in organizing these groups. First, they are to set up techniques for the organization of citizens groups; the second thing is the formation of pressure groups and, third, methods of bringing about group action. The Federal employees were being paid to go out to organize groups to bring pressure on this Congress. One of these statements said that the Federal employees arranged the meetings; they invited the delegates; they trained the delegates, they presided at the meetings, and then framed a formal summary of resolution for action.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the one place we certainly can save the taxpayers' money is the adoption of this amendment and amendments similar to it in all future appropriation bills to cut out this illegal expenditure which amounts to something over \$100,000,000 a year.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, I think this subject is one of greatest importance to the Congress. It deserves more attention than can be given in this fashion in debate on an amendment to an appropriation bill. We are indebted to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] for the information he has presented here in this debate this afternoon, which he derived from his service as counsel for a committee investigating propaganda activities of the Federal Government.

There is far more than merely the amount of money involved in this particular principle. I have previously urged my belief that it is necessary to strengthen the Congress in the interest of formulating national policy by the people themselves. It is a corollary to

that principle that public opinion ought not to be subjected to influence and direction by the executive agencies, the administrative branch of the Government, in the manner that it is today. In a democracy, where public opinion rules in the long run, the media of communication: the press, the radio, television, and the printed word, are very potent weapons in the control of the affairs of this country. The people should not finance use of these agencies to foster and perpetuate the bureaucrats—not the people's objectives in national policy.

If \$100,000,000 is being spent by the Federal agencies in the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of influencing opinion, I say that is a trend and a tendency which is not in the interest of government by the people but in the direction of bureaucratic direction of the thinking of the electorate of this country. That is the basic question which is involved in the principle involved here in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I am not sure that simply prohibiting the use of funds for publicity and propaganda will be an adequate way to deal with this problem. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee to what extent the subcommittee has been able to isolate activities of the Federal Government devoted to propaganda and publicity, and how many employees and how much expense is involved in those activities.

Mr. FOGARTY. For the benefit of the gentleman, I will say that 2 or 3 years ago Mr. Ewing was isolated from most of the publicity and propaganda that was being issued out of that office. When he gets a look at the job they have done on his office today, when they cut out an additional \$250,000, there is not going to be much left in there for any publicity worth while or for the next fiscal year. Whenever we hear of these things, they are taken care of.

Mr. MEADER. Does the committee have a staff which, the year around, examines into the propaganda and publicity activities of the agencies under the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. At the request of the subcommittee, a staff can be arranged to investigate anything. We do not even know what the gentleman calls propaganda. We do not know what he calls the right type of publicity or the wrong type of publicity. That is the fault I find with this amendment.

Mr. MEADER. May I say to the gentleman that I should like to support any movement or any request he may make for additional staff so that we may find out the details about these expenditures and to what extent the agencies which are supposed to carry out policy are attempting to influence policy. In my judgment, the policy should be made here in the Congress and it should be carried out in the executive branch of the Government. It is wrong to have the executive branch of the Government spending the taxpayers' funds to influence public thinking and to create policy.

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree with the gentleman. I also think it should be brought to our attention that the gentleman has just referred to a gentleman who served as counsel for a committee back in 1947 and 1948. The chairman of that committee came before our committee, which was then controlled by the Republicans, and Frank Keefe was chairman of the committee, making some of the charges that have been made this afternoon. They were proven false. There was not an iota of truth about that charge at all. That was under the leadership of the gentleman's own party.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman tell me of any one statement that was made on this floor by me this afternoon which was proven to be false in the Keefe committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not say that.

Mr. BOW. That is exactly the language that was used.

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me get the gentleman straight on that. I am talking about the chairman of the committee the gentleman worked for. He appeared before our committee. There was not one iota of truth in the charges he made before that committee. That is what I said. I speak plain English, and I think the gentleman can hear me as well as anybody else can.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman say what was in the committee report I have read from today that was proven in the Keefe committee not to be true?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not refer to the gentleman, I referred to the chairman that he worked for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to close debate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get excited about this amendment, or at least I will try not to get excited, but I do think it is a poor way of doing business. Here you are limiting the amount of publicity and propaganda which may be issued by any agency of government in this bill and yet you do not define in the amendment what propaganda is or what publicity is. You have no idea at all of the number of publications that are issued or of the type of publications, or anything else. All you want to do is to cut it out and not a word is said about where the cut is to be made. The same thing has been done this afternoon on some of these other cuts. You do not seem to care where the cuts are or whom they are going to affect or how much harm they are going to do to that particular agency or to the defense of the country. I say that especially with reference to the cut which was made on the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service just a few moments ago.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. Does the gentleman have any idea how much additional staff he would need for his subcommittee to

distinguish between legitimate publications such as statistical reports and other official reports of that kind by executive agencies, and propaganda which is designed to influence public opinion? Can the gentleman tell me how much of a staff he would need and whether he has asked for it?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the proper way to get at the bottom of this entire thing is that the gentleman from Wisconsin who has offered the amendment and all the others who have spoken in favor of it should come up with some concrete evidence of what is being issued as propaganda now from the Department of Labor and from the Federal Security Agency. When you give us the proper evidence, then we will take steps. When you produce the proper evidence we will get a sufficient staff to make a thorough investigation. I make that as a promise now. You produce the evidence and give us some of these booklets and pamphlets that you claim are propaganda and are being issued by particular agencies and we will take proper action.

The matter will not have to come before the Congress. The committee will do it, I will go along with the rest of the committee and see to it. I will cut out every dime in the appropriation if you give us any evidence of any pamphlet or booklet or propaganda, which is in a real sense propaganda. I will go along with the rest of the subcommittee and cut out every dime of it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The testimony of Oscar Ewing answers the gentleman's question. He has been propagandizing for compulsory health insurance. He admits it in his own testimony. Is that not propaganda?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman from Wisconsin is talking about his travel.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No, I am not.

Mr. FOGARTY. It would have been an education for you, may I say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, to have been able to sit in with the subcommittee. I do not believe that any man has appeared before us who has been questioned more closely as to his activities and matters he advocates than has the Federal Security Administrator. It is not anything new. It has been going on since he has been Administrator.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Of course, we know that and that is what we are trying to get at in this amendment. He made 18 speeches in 1950, according to his own testimony.

Mr. FOGARTY. That was in 1950. He is not going to do it in 1951, and I do not believe he is going to do it in 1952 because he knows how the committee feels about it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am from Missouri.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have asked the gentleman from Rhode Island to yield in an effort to be helpful to him.

Let me suggest that if he wants evidence as to the unnecessary publicity and propaganda being put out by this and other Government agencies, all he has to do when we close debate today and the Committee rises, and after the House adjourns, is to go over to his office and look in his own wastebasket.

Mr. FOGARTY. A lot of it is coming from the National Association of Manufacturers and the chambers of commerce and all the rest of them. That is where I am getting all the publicity and propaganda.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman throws away everything that he receives from the National Association of Manufacturers.

I am sure he throws everything that he receives from the National Association of Manufacturers into the wastebasket and nothing from the CIO.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I do not. I read them all, because I like to get both sides of the subject. I want to find out who is right and who is wrong, and then try to make up my own honest opinion, and I wish everybody else would do the same.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. A great deal of it comes from the organization of Mr. Rumely, who was convicted today of contempt of court. The resolution to cite him for contempt only passed the House of Representatives by five or six votes.

Most of the Republicans voted against authorizing the contempt proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 144, noes 92.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 156, noes 88.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 39, line 8, insert a new section, as follows:

"No part of any appropriations or authorizations contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and Freedmen's Hospital;

"(e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the effect of my amendment is to permit the Labor-Federal Security agencies to fill 25 percent of the vacancies which occur in those agencies during the fiscal year 1952, with some exceptions, as you will note.

The report on this bill indicates budget reductions of some \$89,973,799 on this bill. However it is not possible to definitely determine just how many people will have to be dropped as a result of this action. Some of the cuts are very substantial and the committee is to be congratulated on their action; however the bulk of the reductions are in items for other administrative cuts. For example, the bill effected reductions in the following, which will have little, if any, effect on administrative costs:

Contingency reserve for Bureau of Employment Security reduced.....	\$4,000,000
Employees compensation fund.....	1,000,000
Vocational education grants.....	1,794,499
Payments to States for vocational rehabilitation.....	2,525,000
Grants to States for hospital construction.....	20,000,000
Grants to States for public assistance.....	50,000,000
Grants to States for child welfare.....	3,000,000
Total.....	82,319,499

It will be noted, therefore, that this leaves something over \$7,000,000 to be applied to administrative costs. How much of this will be applied to the reduction of personnel is questionable since a portion of it could be applied to the procurement of equipment, supplies, and contractual services of various kinds. Thus it can be readily seen that the reduction in personnel is relatively small, probably less than 1,000 employees from the budget request.

I have prepared a tabulation from the appendix of the budget document showing the average number of employees for fiscal years 1950-51 and estimated for 1952. This indicates a total number of employees in this bill of 43,900 in 1950, 46,800 in 1951, and 48,600 for 1952. It is true that some of the specific agencies show less employees; nevertheless in the aggregate there appears to be almost 5,000 more employees requested in 1952 than was provided in 1950. The largest increase seems to be in the Trust Fund of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance which accounts for about 3,800 of the increase.

It might be argued that with respect to this particular bureau that they are not paid for out of appropriated funds, nevertheless this should not be any reason for letting them get out of line. The more we protect the trust fund the less necessary it will be to increase the insurance rate to our citizens in the years to come.

Turn-over in the Government is a serious matter and this amendment, while seeking economy as its primary objective, also provides an incentive for the agencies of government to try to hold the resignations down which in itself provides some economy in the retention of trained employees and the savings of payments for accrued annual leave. Under this amendment if the

agencies can improve working conditions and keep employees longer, they are not penalized.

In the hearings before the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee the Civil Service Commission testified that they expect a 3 percent per month turn-over rate government-wide—page 406, part 1—in fiscal year 1952. It is currently running at a rate of about 2.5 percent and the increase is expected to follow the pattern of the last war when it reached a peak of 5.5 percent in 1943.

This amendment is tailored to fit these particular agencies and will not work any hardship. It is noted also that transfers within the agencies are permitted under my amendment.

On the medical side we are also exempting medical personnel. It is our intention to exempt those medical services directly contributing to the comfort and welfare of the patient. This does not exempt administrative, statistical, and general maintenance personnel. We have likewise exempted custodial employees in the lower grades recognizing that the turn-over rate is quite high in this category.

It is estimated that this amendment will deny the employment of about 8,000 persons in the fiscal year 1952 from the approximately 48,000 requested. Since they will be going off the rolls on a gradual basis we will assume that the 8,000 is the equivalent of 4,000 on a full-year basis. This would figure roughly about \$16,000,000 from the budget request less whatever the committee cut amounts to in terms of personnel. I estimate that this amendment will further reduce the bill now before the House by ten to eleven million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, this is the painless way, and the effective way, to reduce needless Federal employees.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time for the sole purpose of asking the author of the amendment a question. I should like to ask the gentleman whether his amendment applies to veterans within the departments.

Mr. JENSEN. No. No one who is employed today is affected by this amendment whatsoever.

Mr. YATES. What about applicants for jobs who are veterans?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, of course, it applies to them. However, they have priority under the law.

Mr. YATES. But they could not get a job in the face of your amendment even though they have priority under the law.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that the veterans of America are more concerned about saving America than anyone else that I know of. Certainly the gentleman knows that we have today over 2,200,000 people on the Federal payroll which is at least 750,000 more than we should have. The civilian payroll today is costing around \$9,000,000,000. If the gentleman wants to support that kind of needless employment, why he can just go ahead.

Mr. YATES. I take it that the answer to my question about disbaring applicants who are veterans is "Yes."

Mr. JENSEN. Of course it will.

Mr. YATES. That is all.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make this amendment clear to the House. It prohibits the filling of vacancies except to the extent of 25 percent of all those that occur. It makes an exception of hospitals, both in the regular Public Health Service and the one out at Bethesda, and several other units where it is absolutely necessary to fill vacancies.

Veterans who are employed would not be affected. Veterans would be able to have priority on appointments to the 25 percent of vacancies that would be filled.

We all know that the only way really to reduce Federal personnel is to stop the filling of vacancies, and that is what this amendment will do.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I should like to observe in respect to the question asked of the gentleman from Iowa by the gentleman from Illinois just a moment ago that it apparently would contemplate that we were to keep any number of jobs available just so that a veteran might have an opportunity to apply for one of them. My guess about that would be that the veteran would resent that sort of an argument just as much as anyone else here.

Mr. TABER. He would. On top of that, there is a turn-over in the different departments of close to 20 percent in a year. There is going to be plenty of opportunity for the veterans with their preferences to get jobs as things go along.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that we passed approximately this same amendment in the House last year in the omnibus appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. No, that applied to 10 percent of vacancies and this one applies to 25 percent of vacancies.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This is far more liberal than the one the House accepted last year?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and it has other provisions in it. It is a very much broader amendment and more liberal to the departments. I think it is absolutely necessary if we are ever going to save any money to adopt an amendment of this character.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. May I say in answer to the question of the gentleman who asked me about the veterans that if anybody is going to oppose this amendment on the ground that veterans do not have preference, he certainly does not have to worry about the veterans of America being afraid not to get along in America so long as we have an America.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. What if it becomes necessary as a result of events to take a number of people out of Government jobs and put them in the armed forces? Would not this amendment play havoc with respect to the replacement of people in Government positions?

Mr. TABER. No, it would not.

Mr. JENSEN. It would be just exactly the opposite.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to one that was offered to the over-all, one-package appropriation bill last year by the gentleman from Iowa. This one is a little more liberal, but it is the same type of amendment offered at that time. It was carried in the House but it has never been carried into law. It was thrown out in the House and Senate conference because they deemed it at that time to be unworkable, impossible of operation, and everything else. I never heard the conferees condemn an amendment so much as they did that one, because they found there was no possible way of making it work.

The amendment the gentleman offers today is not quite as bad as that one. He exempted the same personnel. Instead of limiting it to 10 percent of vacancies that might be filled in the next year, he raises it to 25 percent. But that is the liberal part of the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. If my amendment had been made law last year we would have saved half a billion dollars, possibly, but instead of that Congress abdicated and we said to the Bureau of the Budget, "Now, you save \$550,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. But it was impossible, may I say to my friend, it was impossible to operate. They just could not find any head nor tail on the whole thing. You could not find out where it began and where it ended. You could not tell at the time it was offered how many jobs were involved or how many jobs it would exempt or what classifications were going to be exempt. I remember very well the afternoon it was offered nobody in the House knew about it. You took us by surprise. There was not a man in the House who could tell us exactly how far the amendment went.

Mr. JENSEN. And it passed the House and should have been made the law of the land, and should be the law today.

Mr. FOGARTY. Not with my vote.

I do not know where the figures came from which the gentleman from Iowa

gave as to the number of positions that are increased in this over-all appropriation bill, but as I recall hearing the figures he gave you, they were way out of line. The figures I have are as given to me by the Clerk who we believe to be infallible, and who is one of the best clerks in the House, and one of the most able and conscientious men. He has handed me these figures. The bill as we have reported it to you, in the Labor Department alone, provides for a cut of about 670 positions below what they had in 1951, assuming the cuts against administrative appropriations are all applied to salary items, as most of it would be. That is not below the budget estimate, but below what they had in 1951. The Clerk informed me that figure comes from a quick calculation made by the Department at his request. As far as the Federal Security Agency is concerned, on the same basis, we cut them about 830 positions below what they had last year—not below the budget estimate, but below what they had last year. That is what we are talking about. We are not talking about budget estimates. We are talking about decreases and cuts that we have made below the 1951 figures, and if you show me another committee that comes in with a bill like this one and which will show as deep cuts as we have made I want to be around to see it. In all honesty and in all fairness to the gentleman from Iowa, I want to say that we have been sincere in our efforts this year to bring in a good bill. We have gone much further in cuts than I would like to have gone, to be honest with you. Deeper cuts have been made in places in this bill than I have voted for since I have been a member of this committee.

I believe it was the insistence of men like George Schwabe and Fred Busbey and others, and some on the Democratic side, and because of the situation we find ourselves in at the present time, as well as our economic situation, that I went along because we wanted to have a unanimous report. I tried to explain yesterday in general debate the limited field that we have to work in where we can make cuts. I tried to explain yesterday that 88 percent of the appropriations for the Department of Labor is tied up in items that we cannot touch because it is in two grants, grants to the States for employment security, and the employees compensation fund. Those two items amount to 88 percent of the total Labor Department appropriation bill. We only had 12 percent of the appropriation to work with, and we cut that part of the appropriation by almost 10 percent. We also cut it below 1951. That is what we did with the Labor Department.

I gave the figures yesterday showing how we were effectively limited in making greater cuts in appropriations for the Federal Security Agency, particularly because of legislation that ties our hands. There we went below what they had last year.

There are many things that I was personally interested in, and which I would like to have seen the committee increase. But we just could not do it under present

circumstances. I have not had a chance to talk about public health here this afternoon. If only I had my way there would be some of these national institutes, like the Heart, Cancer, Mental Health, Arthritis, Neurological Diseases, and Blind Institutes. If I only had my way, they would get more money because we could save lives by giving such institutes money. This year I had hoped to be able to do something for the Cancer Institute. It is cancer month now and the cancer drive is going on all over the country. I do not believe there is an uglier word in our dictionary or in our vocabulary than the word "cancer." Cancer is killing over 200,000 people a year right here in our country. I would like to have offered an amendment to increase them by \$5,000,000 for an educational program. If you men could have seen some of the people I have seen, some of them close to me, who have died from cancer, you would have gone along with me. If you had gone along with me a year ago on that raise, that would have been the greatest answer to socialized medicine that could have been made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY), there were—ayes 144, noes 100.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Jensen amendment that was just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, line 8, insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriations or authorizations contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all such vacancies.

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency.

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service St. Elizabeths Hospital, and Freedmens Hospital.

"(e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 208, nays 145, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—208

Aandahl	Dempsey	Keating
Abernethy	Denny	Kersten, Wis.
Adair	Devereux	Kilburn
Allen, Calif.	D'Ewart	Latham
Allen, Ill.	Dolliver	LeCompte
Andersen,	Dondero	Lovre
H. Carl	Dorn	Lucas
Anderson, Calif.	Ellsworth	McConnell
Andresen,	Fallon	McCulloch
August H.	Fellows	McDonough
Andrews	Fenton	McGregor
Angell	Fernandez	McMillan
Arends	Ford	McVey
Armstrong	Forrester	Mack, Wash.
Auchincloss	Frazier	Martin, Iowa
Ayres	Fulton	Martin, Mass.
Baker	Gamble	Mason
Bakewell	Gathings	Meader
Bates, Mass.	Gavin	Merrow
Battle	Golden	Miller, Md.
Beall	Goodwin	Morano
Beamer	Gossett	Morton
Belcher	Graham	Mumma
Bender	Gross	Murray, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Gwinn	Nelson
Berry	Hagen	Nicholson
Betts	Hale	Norblad
Bishop	Hall,	O'Hara
Blackney	Edwin Arthur	O'Konski
Boggs, Del.	Hall,	Ostertag
Bolton	Leonard W.	Patten
Bow	Halleck	Patterson
Boykin	Harden	Phillips
Bramblett	Harris	Pickett
Bray	Harrison, Va.	Poulson
Brown, Ohio	Harrison, Wyo.	Radwan
Brownson	Harvey	Rankin
Bryson	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Buffett	Herlong	Reed, Ill.
Busbey	Herter	Reed, N. Y.
Bush	Heselton	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Hess	Ribicoff
Byrnes, Wis.	Hill	Richards
Case	Hillings	Rivers
Chenoweth	Hoeven	Sadlak
Church	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Clevenger	Holmes	Sasscer
Cole, Kans.	Hope	Saylor
Cole, N. Y.	Horan	Schwabe
Colmer	Hull	Scott, Hardie
Cooper	Hunter	Scott,
Corbett	Irving	Hugh D., Jr.
Cox	Jackson, Calif.	Scrivner
Crawford	James	Scudder
Crumpacker	Ja'man	Seely-Brown
Cunningham	Jenison	Shafer
Curtis, Mo.	Jenkins	Sheehan
Curtis, Nebr.	Jensen	Short
Dague	Johnson	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Simpson, Ill.
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Wis.	Kearns	Smith, Miss.

Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Taber
Talle
Thompson,
Mich.
Tollefson

Van Felt
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Welchel
Werdel
Wharton
Wheeler
Widnall
Wigglesworth

Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.

Mr. Chipfield for, with Mr. Sieminski against.
Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Heller against.
Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Hart against.
Mr. Stockman for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Lesinski against.
Mr. Sittler for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. O'Toole against.
Mr. George for, with Mr. McKinnon against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Yorty against.
Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Wickersham against.
Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.
Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Miller of Nebraska for, with Mr. Dawson against.
Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Abbutt against.
Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Raines with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Vail.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Cotton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in the engrossment of the bill just passed, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make any necessary correction in section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, April 20, to file a report on the Department of the Interior appropriation for 1952.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

NAYS—145

Addonizio
Albert
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Bresne
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Carlyle
Carnahan
Chatham
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Cresser
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Donohue
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle
Felghan
Fine
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Fugate
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon

Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Hardy
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Hollfield
Howell
Jackson, Wash.
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones,
Hamilton C.
Jones,
Woodrow W.
Karsten, Mo.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Lind
Lyle
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McMullen
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marshall
Miller, Calif.
Mills

Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Moulder
Murdock
Murphy
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Neill
Patman
Perkins
Philbin
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Rhodes
Riley
Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Secret
Shelley
Spence
Steed
Stigler
Tackett
Teague
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Welch
Whitaker
Whitten
Wier
Willis
Winstead
Yates
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—80

Abbutt
Allen, La.
Anfuso
Bailey
Barden
Brehm
Brooks
Buchanan
Budge
Burdick
Burleson
Burton
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Celler
Chipfield
Cotton
Coudert
Dawson
Dingell
Donovan
Doughton
Eaton
Elston
Evins
Fisher

George
Gillette
Gore
Greenwood
Hand
Hart
Heller
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Mich.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kluczynski
Larcade
Lesinski
McKinnon
Machrowicz
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morrison
Multer
Murray, Wis.
O'Toole
Passman
Potter
Powell
Prouty

Rains
Reams
Redden
Regan
Riehlman
Roberts
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Sheppard
Sieminski
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Staggers
Stockman
Sutton
Taylor
Towe
Vail
Vaughn
Velde
Vinson
Walter
Wickersham
Wood, Idaho
Woodruff
Yorty

So the amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Greenwood against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Staggers against.
Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Walter against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Buchanan against.
Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Multer against.

House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no District business on Monday. There will be H. R. 3461, which relates to naval installations, on which a rule has been granted.

Also H. R. 3096 from the Armed Services Committee relating to acquisition and disposition of land and interest in land by the Army and other branches of the Department of Defense.

Then there will be general debate on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

If there are any roll calls, it is understood that they will be put over until Tuesday.

On Tuesday will be a continuation, under the 5-minute rule, of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday are undetermined at the present time.

I have been informed that sometime during next week the supplementary appropriation for the military will be reported out. If so, it will be taken up.

Any other program for next week I will announce to the House as soon as I possibly can.

Of course, conference reports, if any, may be brought up at any time.

AMENDING THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1951, I introduced the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

I am at this time introducing another bill 3755 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act in order that there may be a proposal setting forth legislation suggested by 4 of the 22 railway labor organizations, through their respective chiefs who did not join in proposing H. R. 3669, which was proposed and urged by 18 of the 22 chiefs, speaking for their 18 railway labor organizations.

As soon as the hearings now scheduled before the committee have been completed, we hope to have hearings at once—not only on the two measures to which I have referred, but also to receive any testimony bearing upon the other bills referred to our Committee for the purpose of amending the Railroad Retirement Act.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 2084

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Ways and Means Committee reported the bill (H. R. 2084) relating to powers of appointment covering the estate and gift tax provisions. I ask unanimous consent that those wishing to do so may have until tomorrow to file minority views on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] I ask unanimous consent that the special order we have for today may be postponed until Wednesday next following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered, to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

GENERALS AND POLITICS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today I publicly raised the question of President Truman's arbitrary right to strip General MacArthur of the powers that were vested in him by international agencies of which the United States is but one participant.

In the week that has elapsed, Truman has failed to provide a clean and clear bill of particulars in support of his action.

If the charge is one of military insubordination then the preliminary steps toward a court martial should have been taken within a matter of hours after MacArthur was relieved of his command.

If the general was removed because of differences in diplomatic policy then Truman should make plain when and where such authority was delegated to him by the United Nations Security Council and the Far Eastern Commission.

Congress and the American people are entitled to know now and not another year or two hence whether this is another Truman usurpation of power.

Mr. Speaker, it was with amazement and deep regret that I read the text of a speech made yesterday in Chicago by Gen. Omar Bradley to the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters.

In that speech, General Bradley went far beyond the realm of the military and into the field of so-called American foreign policy. It is understood that the Bradley speech was cleared by the State Department and Dean Acheson, whose back has not yet been turned on Alger Hiss.

Presumably, the military can discuss and support so-called foreign policy on any platform as long as it is the brand endorsed by Acheson and Truman.

Here we have the spectacle of one five-star general, Bradley, being permitted, even aided and abetted by the State Department, to voice foreign policy, where-

as another five-star general, MacArthur, is castigated and crucified for allegedly entering the same field.

Still another five-star general, Eisenhower, was turned loose under the Atlantic Pact label to propagandize the Truman-Acheson European policies.

Therefore, I reiterate, it appears that it is perfectly all right for the generals to indulge in policies and politics unlimited—as long as they stay on the Truman-Acheson side of the fence.

In other words, the high brass can now speak on any and every subject, the only requirement being that they clear it with Dean.

I might add that it seems to me, General Bradley, as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ought to have enough work these days to keep him completely occupied at the Pentagon.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REMOVAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Members of this House will have the opportunity of hearing an important address from one of our greatest generals, Douglas MacArthur, a man who has done a magnificent job as the occupation commander in Japan. Regardless of our thoughts about the general on other matters, we, I think, should pay him this honor and should consider the words which he will bring to us tomorrow.

In looking through the annual reports which Gen. Douglas MacArthur furnished each year when he was Chief of Staff, I came across a very wise section of that report which I believe the people of the Nation should have the benefit of. I am therefore at this time going to read a short paragraph from the annual report of Chief of Staff Douglas MacArthur for the fiscal year 1932, page 97:

The national strategy of any war—that is the selection of national objectives and the determination of the general means and methods to be applied in attaining them, as well as the development of the broad policies applicable to the prosecution of war—are decisions that must be made by the head of the State, acting in conformity with the expressed will of the Congress. No single departmental head, no matter what his particular function or title, could or should be responsible for the formulation of such decisions. For example, in every war the United States has waged, the national objective to be attained has involved the Army in land attacks against areas held by the enemy. In every instance missions have been prescribed for the Navy that had in view the assisting and facilitating of the Army's efforts. Yet in no case could these missions and objectives have been properly prescribed by the Secretaries of War and Navy acting in unison or by a single supersecretary acting for both. The issues involved were so far-reaching in their effects, and so vital to the life of the Nation, that this phase of coordinating Army and Navy effort could not be delegated by the Commander in Chief to any subordinate authority. Any such attempt would not constitute delegation, but rather abdication.

I believe those are words, Mr. Speaker, that should be studied by every American, and I am sure they will be.

The basic issue in the controversy surrounding the removal of General MacArthur is the supremacy of civilian over military rule in the United States. The principle of civilian supremacy goes to the very heart of our democratic Government. The United States was built upon that principle and it must be forever safeguarded.

Therefore it must be strongly emphasized and clearly understood that the President had no other recourse but to remove General MacArthur when he persisted in making public statements of policy that went far beyond his military authority and that were in conflict with the policy of the Government of the United States and of the United Nations.

It makes no difference whether we think MacArthur is a great man or a stuffed shirt; it makes no difference whether we are Republicans or Democrats; whether we like Harry Truman or not. The single, stark, and compelling consideration is that when a military man sets himself above his civilian Commander in Chief and repeatedly engages in acts of insubordination, he must be removed from his military office.

As far as I am concerned, no man, and certainly no military man, is more important than the Constitution of the United States. Someday the personalities involved in this controversy will pass from the scene. Our children and grandchildren will judge the event, not by our personal likes and dislikes, but by our devotion to an enduring principle of democratic, constitutional government.

The President carried out his plain and inevitable duty under the Constitution. By that charter, he is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and he is also made responsible for the conduct of our foreign policy. In the final analysis, he must account for his conduct to the American people at the ballot box in the democratic way.

General MacArthur does not have to account to the American people at the ballot box. Of course, he can present himself as a candidate. In 1948, General MacArthur allowed his name to be entered into the Republican nomination for the Presidency, but received only a handful of votes at the Republican convention. On the contrary, General MacArthur, being a five-star general, will draw a life-time salary of \$18,761 per year. In addition to that he can take a civilian job or run for public office or take life easy. Besides full pay, he will be entitled, for the rest of his life, to have two or three officers or enlisted men as personal aides.

Careful observers are convinced that General MacArthur knew full well what he was doing when he repeatedly defied the President of the United States. The conclusion is that General MacArthur forced the issue on the President, that he wanted to be either a savior or a martyr and if he could not be one, he wanted to be the other.

These observers have pointed out that General MacArthur had good reason to know the consequences of insubordination. As Walter Lippmann, the noted columnist said:

It is impossible to believe that a soldier of his eminence and his experience, himself

a former Chief of Staff, himself a commander of armies who must know the importance of discipline, cannot have known that he was challenging the authority of his lawful superiors. (Washington Post, April 12, 1951.)

And, mind you, this challenge by General MacArthur was not only to his own Government, as Walter Lippmann said:

He challenged the President publicly, defiantly and on issues of such moment that they concerned deeply not only this Government, but some 50 other governments.

MacArthur knew about the consequences of insubordination. As an Army general he sat on a military court through the long weeks of trial of another famous general—Billy Mitchell—who was court-martialed, not so much for defying the President of the United States, as for challenging his superior officers' limited views on air power.

Gen. Billy Mitchell himself wrote 10 years after the trial:

MacArthur, whom I admired for his courage, his audacity and sincerity, surely could not be part of this. But there he was, his features as cold as carved stone.

Recalling that he had fought under MacArthur's father in the Philippine Insurrection and discussed with him in those early days the danger of a southward drive of Japanese imperialism, Billy Mitchell lamented:

And here was his son, a brave soldier, appointed to strip me in midcareer, in an argument over a machine which might some day save the Philippine Islands.

Gen. Billy Mitchell wondered whether General MacArthur would even learn the lessons of air power which he failed to learn in Billy Mitchell's trial. Others have wondered, too, noting that MacArthur was embarrassed by the destruction of American airplanes in the Philippines on Pearl Harbor Day as they sat naked and exposed on Clark Field—and this despite the fact that the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor had occurred 10 hours earlier.

MacArthur never thought that the Japanese would attack Manila in 1941. But back in 1925, when Billy Mitchell cried out against the danger of Japanese attack, at least MacArthur knew what would happen to a military man who did not know how to take orders.

In his analysis of the Truman-MacArthur controversy, Walter Lippmann, as astute an observer as we have on world affairs today, concludes that General MacArthur deliberately intended to force a show-down with the President of the United States on the issue of a general war in the Far East.

He did this—

Said Lippmann—

by compelling the President to choose publicly between relieving him or submitting to him.

Now I ask you, how can the President of the United States, invested by the Constitution with the dual functions of Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, submit to a military general? The question is answered by the asking. I do not care what your views are toward General MacArthur or President Truman: If you

have any respect for the Constitution and the laws of the United States—and I know you do—you must agree that no other course was left open to the President than to take the action he did.

Let me assure you that this was no arbitrary and capricious act of the President. He was acting with the full knowledge and approval of the Chiefs of Staff, those high officers of the Military Establishment who are responsible for determining our military policy.

This was not a controversy between General MacArthur and Secretary of State Dean Acheson, as some of our Republican friends would have us believe. The question was whether General MacArthur was in sympathy with, and giving his support to, the policy formulated by the President of the United States with the advice of his Chiefs of Staff. The answer was "No": General MacArthur took issue with his superiors, civilian and military.

I am glad that General MacArthur decided to return to the United States. He has not set foot on these continental shores for over 14 years. He has a boy 13 years old who never saw this country until a few days ago.

General MacArthur is entitled to—indeed, he has a duty—to express his views before the Congress, just as any other citizen who has knowledge and information which may be of benefit to his country. Whether those views ultimately will prevail, in whole or in part, will be determined by future experience, by the give and take of public debate on these momentous issues of war and peace, and possibly at the ballot box.

I do want to express this thought: It is indeed regrettable and highly unfortunate that General MacArthur has allowed himself to become immersed in partisan politics. As General Eisenhower has pointed out, when a man puts on the military uniform of his country, he thereby necessarily agrees to accept certain restraints—certain "inhibitions" as General Eisenhower expressed it.

The austere and somewhat isolated life of the military camp is not always a good school for politics. General MacArthur may have reason to regret in the future that he entered into the dusty arena of rough and tumble politics while still wearing his impeccable uniform. He may find that politics has ways that are strange to him. He may find that politics is a destroyer of myths and a debunker of heroes. He may find that the spotless uniform of the general will become soiled and a little bedraggled before this controversy comes to rest.

Political orators will take sides. They will extol their hero on the one side, or criticize him on the other. Some will point to his brilliant record in France with the Rainbow Division during World War I, to his achievements as chief of staff in the 1930's, to his service with the Philippine Government, and later to his role in World War II.

His detractors will note that the general led the Armed Forces of the United States in the battle of Anacostia Flats when they fired on the poor, hungry and ragged veterans who had come to the

Nation's Capital in 1932 on a bonus march.

They will point out to their audience that General MacArthur led the United Nations forces triumphantly up to the banks of the Yalu River in November 1950, scoffing at the idea of Chinese Communist intervention and promising the American soldiers that they "would be home for Christmas," and then being compelled to order a retreat across the frozen wastes of North Korea as a result of one of the most colossal military blunders of American history.

But that controversy and taking of sides was General MacArthur's choice when he forced the President to make a decision. The general is now 71 years of age. He could have retired from the military scene secure in the knowledge that he had made a name for himself among the military great, that he had devoted himself to a long and fruitful career in the service of his country, that the people of America understood and were truly grateful.

The general could have retired at the climax of a long and brilliant career, quietly, honorably, and with dignity. Instead, he chose the thorny path of partisan politics, inviting the noisy clamor of violent and passionate argument over the merits or demerits of his position.

What the consequences will be to General MacArthur's place in history is difficult to foretell. But reasonable men will have to say that these consequences were of MacArthur's own choosing.

There is added reason to regret that General MacArthur has become involved in a partisan, political fight. He was winding up a successful period of 5 years in command of the occupation forces in Japan. From all the evidence I have, General MacArthur was strikingly successful in carrying out occupation policies in Japan.

Most notable of his achievements is the comprehensive program of land reform which ended the exploitative system of landlordism and absentee ownership heretofore prevailing in rural Japan. Most of the peasants in Japan today are working their own land, and those relatively few that rent do so from resident owners.

Americans today should make a close study of this revolutionary change in Japanese land tenure, and learn how to apply its lessons in a forthright and systematic way to other parts of Asia. The salvation of Asia and its retention for the free world lies in reform of its land-tenure system.

Curious it is that some of MacArthur's most zealous supporters today are those who would be least in sympathy with his occupation program of land reform, the breaking up of the Japanese industrial monopolies, and the promotion of labor unionism. I would much rather have preferred to see General MacArthur come back to this country and testify about what he did in the transformation of Japanese agriculture than to appear as the symbol of criticism against the President and the State Department and probably become the instrument of

clever and unscrupulous political manipulators.

Personally, I doubt whether these politicians give a hoot for MacArthur himself, but they are willing to use him for a political bridgehead into 1952. It remains to be seen whether MacArthur will be any more obedient to the politicians who are now trying to ride on his military coattails than he was to his superior officers.

In the few days following the removal of General MacArthur, Members of Congress were deluged with telegrams and letters, many of them sincere and well-meant, others inspired in bulk by anti-administration newspapers and commentators. Frequently among these communications there appeared the demand that President Truman be impeached. It is deeply disturbing to see these indications of attitudes taken on a purely emotional basis without thinking through their meaning.

The stability and safety of America rests on the common sense of its people and the cool, considered judgment of its leaders. Indiscriminate demands for the impeachment of the President contribute no more to national unity and sound policy than indiscriminate demands that we rush blindly and headlong into a war with Communist China.

Under the Constitution of the United States, the President or any other officer of the Government can be impeached for committing certain high crimes or misdemeanors. I trust that cool heads will prevail over this curious and strident clamor for impeaching the President when the President was only carrying out his plain duty under the laws and Constitution of the United States.

There are some people who see political benefit in hysteria. There are some people, as the President pointed out the other day, who calculate that confusion would work for them. If there is one thing our political experience teaches us, it is that men who seek political advantage by nourishing fear, panic, and hysteria are not worthy of the office they seek. They appeal to the worst, not the best, in American life. If they are allowed to guide the Nation's destiny, then this country will rush toward chaos, amidst the ranting of demagogues.

Note that the best-informed and most-responsible elements of the American press have endorsed the President's removal of General MacArthur. Newspapers like the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and other great dailies, have taken that position in their editorial pages.

If you are concerned about your country's future and you wish to contribute to the solution of the problems which threaten its very existence, then you have to think through the basic issues. Base your judgments, not on irritations, resentments, and anxiety, but on calm, cold reasoning about events. To be angry is no solution to anything. Nor are there easy answers to the problems that beset this Nation.

Before you decide where you stand on the MacArthur issue, try to think through the implications of his stated

position. Do you want more war in Asia or less war? Our Government is leading the fight in Korea today as a localized war, a war against aggression. General MacArthur's position is pointed toward an all-out war, with Communist China and probably through that vast engagement, into a world war III.

Contrast MacArthur's view with that of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, another great soldier and a great American. General Bradley, chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said:

Any recommended course of action which would enlarge the present war is contrary to our best interests.

Ask yourselves, Are we ready to wage all-out war? My answer is, decidedly, "No." Our defense mobilization program in this country is just a few months' old. We have made substantial progress, but we have not begun to approach the dimensions of the task before us. America is readying her defenses and keeping the pipelines filled to our fighting men in Korea, but America is not ready to take on the whole Communist world.

Ask yourselves, Is War inevitable? My answer is "No; war is not inevitable." But General MacArthur apparently is proceeding on the assumption that it is, and he wants to rush it along.

From the men in the Kremlin who control the destiny of the Communist world, we cannot expect friendship and good will. We know better than to seek to placate them by appeasement. Between freedom and tyranny there will always be hostility. But it does not follow that hostility must become wholesale war. The aggressive ideology of communism can be curbed without a world war, if we make the necessary show of strength.

America cannot do it alone: We need friends and allies. To build our own defenses, to put guns into the hands of our friends, takes time. The essence of our Government's policy today is to limit warfare in places where aggression is manifest and to deploy our strategic forces carefully throughout the world at potential danger points rather than to throw all of our resources indiscriminately into one vast undertaking that will consume these resources quickly and dissipate our national energies.

That would be the case if we carried the war to Communist China, as General MacArthur would have us do, rather than to fight it out in Korea, where we are holding our own today and taking a terrible toll of the enemy.

Ask yourselves, what will be Russia's position if we carry this war to the massive continent of Asia, to the jungles and deserts of China? Russia is pledged by treaty to aid Red China in case of an attack. Undoubtedly Russia has thousands of airplanes stationed in Siberia ready to make an assault on Japan in case we become embroiled in armed conflict with Russia. Today, with our commitments in Korea, we could not keep Japan from Russian hands and the loss of the Japanese productive machine to the Communists would mean that all Asia would be lost to us.

In an interview with a military correspondent of the London Daily Times, General MacArthur expressed the opinion that it was "improbable" that Russia would intervene if we supported the use of Chinese Nationalist troops from Formosa or the bombing of the Chinese mainland. The Christian Science Monitor, a leading American newspaper, comments editorially in this connection—April 7, 1951:

A number of GIs remember ruefully that the five-star general also was sure that the Communist Chinese would not interfere when he spread his troops widely over northern Korea where they took one of the worst defeats in American military history.

As indicated above, General MacArthur appears to favor the use of Chinese Nationalist troops now garrisoned on the island of Formosa to make assaults on the mainland of China and presumably thereby to divert attention and emphasis now given by Chinese Red forces to the fighting in Korea. This position seems sensible on the face of it. It has been compared by some of our Republican friends to the Russian use of satellite troops to do some of her fighting.

If we stop and think it through, there is no sense whatever in the use of Chinese troops on Formosa. We have no assurance at all that these troops are, or will remain, trustworthy. During the civil war in China, large numbers of Nationalist troops went over to the Communists, carrying arms and supplies we had given to the Nationalist Government. It is no secret that for 10 years before the Communist victory in China, the Nationalist Government had the overwhelming advantage in manpower and armament, but with 10 years of such advantage, the Nationalist Government was unable to subdue and pacify the Communists.

During World War II, our Government trained Chinese Nationalist troops and donated large amounts of equipment and supplies to China in the war against Japan. Since VJ-day, the United States Government authorized to China some \$2,000,000,000 in grants and credits, an amount equivalent in value to more than 50 percent of the monetary expenditures of the Chinese Government, and greater in proportion to the Chinese budget than similar aid by the United States to any other Nation in Western Europe since the war.

In addition to these grants and credits, the United States Government sold the Chinese Government large amounts of civilian and war surplus property with a total procurement cost of over \$1,000,000,000, for which the agreed realization to the United States was \$232,000,000. Substantial quantities of the military supplies furnished the Chinese armies since VJ-day have fallen into the hands of the Chinese Communists through the ineptitude, cowardice, or corruption of the Nationalist leaders or the apathy of their people.

Today we have the sad realization that some of the bullets being shot at our American soldiers in Korea come from American guns originally provided to the soldiers of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, which subsequently have fallen into the hands of the Communists.

You know, and I know, that the use of Chinese Nationalist troops from Formosa would never be effective without the furnishing of huge amounts of American equipment and supplies and manpower so that sooner or later the employment of those troops, supplies, and equipment would involve us in full-scale war in China. It would satisfy the generalissimo's purposes very nicely to embroil us in a continental war with Communist China, because that is the only hope he has in the world to reestablish his power.

To me the fighting today in Korea and the sacrificing of American blood is a fight for freedom and not a fight to serve the ambitions of a disgruntled generalissimo who has been bypassed by history.

As yourselves, what would happen to our allies and particularly the nations of Western Europe with whom we are dedicated jointly in the defense of freedom, if MacArthur's views were to be followed out? MacArthur's independent pronouncements made without the sanction of his Government constituted a slap in the face of the European nations with whom we are working for a joint-defense program under the direction of General Eisenhower.

In martial accents, MacArthur declared that European diplomats were talking while a war was being fought in Asia. The important thing to remember is, that our Nation is dedicated to the fight for freedom in all parts of the world. MacArthur, who has been out of this country for a decade and a half, who is not acquainted with the intricate details of our relationships with Europe, who has never shown any particular knowledge of, or interest in, Europe as the cradle of western civilization, simply lacks the perspective and the balanced appraisal of American commitments in the fight for freedom.

MacArthur's insistence on charting his own independent course of foreign policy regardless of the Department of Defense, regardless of the State Department, regardless of the President of the United States, was rapidly alienating those nations of Europe who looked upon his program, rightly or wrongly, as a bypassing of European defense and wholesale investment of our resources and energies in a futile land war with China.

It makes no difference whether you feel friendly or unfriendly toward countries like Great Britain or other European countries. The fact remains that in these countries we will find the energy and the will and the resources to help us to oppose Communist aggression throughout the world.

No, my friends, this is no time to lose ourselves in a sea of emotion, hysteria, or hate. This is the time to exercise calmness and collective judgment. The problem is not just to win a quick military victory in Korea. Korea is important because there, for the first time, the collective force of free nations is in action against unwarranted totalitarian aggression.

The real problem is to organize and equip the free nations of the world against atheistic communism.

The problem is to prevent the industrial potential and the techniques of the Ruhr, Japan, and other industrial areas from falling into Soviet control.

The problem is to keep the oil of Iran from the tanks and planes of the U. S. S. R. If we fail in these objectives by prematurely exploding the crisis of a third world war, then indeed we shall see freedom perish from the earth. Then indeed we will fail to meet the great challenge of our age and liberty will give way to slavery of the body and mind of men.

THE LATE HENRY J. GILLEN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 of this year one of the outstanding newspapermen of the country, a personal friend of mine whom I admired very much, Henry J. Gillen, died. The late Henry Gillen was a man beloved by everyone who knew him or knew of him. He was a brilliant member of his profession. His devotion to his profession and his outstanding ability was recognized throughout the years, and he rose consistently from position to higher positions of trust. At the time of his unfortunate death he was trustee, chief editorial writer, and assistant city editor of the Boston Post. He was highly respected and will always be remembered for his nobility of character, his integrity, his intellectual capacity, his understanding mind, and his fairness.

The late Henry Gillen was born in the Roxbury section of Boston, Mass. He was educated at Boston College and was cited by the president of Boston College at the time that he was a student therein as "the brightest student in Boston College in a decade." Throughout his college career he was employed as the college correspondent for the Boston Post and during the summertime as a cub reporter. After serving in World War I with distinction, the late Henry J. Gillen became a reporter on the Boston Post and was connected with that great newspaper until the time of his death.

The late Henry J. Gillen's contributions to civic, charitable, and public activities will long be remembered. He was an intellectual giant and contributed through his editorials and writing and otherwise, to the intellectual progress of New England. He was one of the most widely read members of his profession, and his keen logic and thoughts and his powerful expression of the same in the written form left a profound impression upon all of the readers of the Boston Post.

One of the outstanding editorials ever written, and particularly relating to a presidential campaign, was written by the late Henry J. Gillen in 1948, just prior to election day, an editorial entitled "Captain Courageous." In this editorial Mr. Gillen predicted the election in 1948 of President Truman. In the editorial

that he wrote he gave strong, convincing reasons as to why President Truman should be elected. He was one of the few newspapermen, in fact, one of the few persons in any field of human activity, who accurately analyzed and forecast the election results of 1948.

In addition to his many duties in the newspaper field, in radio discussions, in Editorial Association conferences, in charitable work, and in other fields of constructive activity, the late Henry J. Gillen still had time to take a prominent part in community and civic affairs. He was always the leader in every movement that represented progress.

The late Henry J. Gillen was a good man—a man of understanding mind who loved God and loved his fellowmen and who lived up to the spiritual truths that he believed in. His passing at a comparatively early age leaves a vacancy that will be hard to fill. The newspaper profession throughout the country has lost one of its great constructive members; yes, leaders. Massachusetts has lost one of its great citizens. Boston has lost one of its great friends. I have lost one whom I admired greatly and whose friendship I valued very much.

It is very seldom that remarks are made on the floor of the House about the death of anyone who is not a Member of the House or who did not formerly serve in the House of Representatives, but the life and the contributions of the late Henry J. Gillen were such during his span on earth that I take the floor of the House today to call the attention of my colleagues to the death of this truly great man.

COMMENT ON RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED IN THE SENATE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and include the text of a speech made in Chicago on April 17 by Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, there are no simple and easy ways of finding and maintaining peace in the world. The American people are rightly concerned about the duration of the conflict in Korea and about our mounting American casualties. However, they will find no answer in the resolutions proposed yesterday in the other body.

On the one hand, a Member of the other body from my State of Washington proposes that we throw away the gains we have made in Korea, ignore the sacrifices we have made, and pull out of that country lock, stock, and barrel. On the other hand, he proposes the alternative that we carry the war to the mainland of China, thereby exposing us to a vast, unlimited undertaking in the deserts and jungles of this massive region and to the imminent prospect of a third world war. The Chinese mainland as a battlefield will make Korea look like a flyspeck.

Soviet Russia and Red China are committed to a mutual-assistance pact, and

there is good reason to suppose that if we attack the Chinese mainland Siberian-based Russian planes will launch a devastating blow on Japan. If Japan goes to the Communists all Asia goes with her.

This country, as a member of the United Nations, is committed to opposing aggression wherever and whenever it shows up. The war in Korea today is a limited war against aggression. We are taking a terrible toll of the aggressors while restricting the battlefield to a small and relatively maneuverable area.

The two opposing resolutions introduced in the other body show an understandable impatience with the present Korean situation, but they are dangerously deceptive if they pretend to offer a solution to our problem. The author belongs to the all-or-none school which insists on seeing things black or white in a world which is gray with uncertainty and danger.

Personally, I prefer to base my judgment on the advice of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, a great soldier and a great American. General Bradley has made it clear that "any recommended course of action which would enlarge the present war is contrary to our best interests." That disposes of any proposal to declare war on Communist China. The other proposal, to pull out of Korea completely, is a rank kind of isolationism which hardly deserves consideration in the light of our commitments as a responsible member of the United Nations.

The two opposing resolutions foster confusion in a world which so badly needs understanding. Widespread study of General Bradley's Chicago speech would foster this understanding and, by unanimous consent, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

It is hard to realize that our relatively small-scale military operations in Korea hold the key to the success or failure of our world-wide strategy.

In the hands of our United Nations soldiers, sailors, and airmen, fighting the unwarranted attacks of twice as many North Korean and Chinese Communist aggressors, rests the possibility for peace. Success in Korea may prevent a new incident, and may prevent world war III. Failure in Korea will only invite another aggression.

When our forces were in the throes of withdrawal last December, many people, who saw no point to further struggle, were recommending that we give up the fight. Nothing could have been more disastrous for the South Koreans, the United States, the United Nations, and the ultimate chances for peace in this world.

As much as I hate war, if we had abandoned Korea under any less circumstances than being driven out, we would have dealt a tragic blow to the hopes of freemen everywhere for peace.

EARLY END NOT IN SIGHT

Adding up the military pros and cons of the situation, there is no early end in sight to the Korean war under present conditions. As far as we can see now, there is nothing transitory—nothing temporary—about the Communists' determination to drive us out of Korea, and, if possible, to destroy our forces completely. We may strive for peace and a cessation of hostilities, but while so doing we must continue to fight.

Foreign policy is the expression of a nation's instinct for survival. Military policy

comprises the practices of a people in the organization of their military resources for defense.

There is little immediate danger of this country being overrun, but our way of life, our freedom, and our Nation have the best chances for survival by keeping peace in the world. This is the overriding consideration of our national foreign and military policies. Any recommended course of action which would enlarge the present war is contrary to our best interests, and by jeopardizing world peace ultimately would threaten our security.

THREE BASIC OBJECTIVES

In Korea our foreign policy and our military policy are united in three basic objectives:

First, to protect and maintain our form of government and our way of life against any challenge. On this point we recognize no limitation of expenditures or of exertion.

Second, to seek peace by every means at our command. We will not provoke a war against anyone. And we will not wage a so-called preventive war even against an arch-enemy, for this certainly destroys peace. But there is one price we will not pay—appeasement.

Third, to assure peace, not only for ourselves, but for all others. For this reason we support the United Nations, realizing that world peace is an integral part of American security.

I would like to emphasize that our military action in Korea is closely related to our North Atlantic Treaty efforts in Europe. The same guiding principles govern our actions there. We joined in the North Atlantic Treaty as a collective defense effort for mutual security. In collective action, we multiply our defensive strength. Bound together in a pact, the individual nations gain strength from their close ties, and individually, are more secure.

HOPE TO CURB AGGRESSION

Not only are we trying to contain communism but we hope to deter all forms of aggression in order to bring peace to the world. Through our efforts in connection with the North Atlantic Treaty, and our even more positive action in Korea, we have drawn the line—giving unmistakable evidence that appeasement of communism is not part of American policy.

In Korea communism went without warning one step further than it had ever gone before, and for the first time resorted to open and organized armed aggression to gain its oppressive ends, shedding even its pretense of peaceful intention.

The United Nations had to take some quick, positive action. The decision to support the Republic of Korea, first with air and sea power, and then, with ground forces, was heralded in this country as a sound decision, and given wholehearted support. Like every other international political decision from time immemorial, there had to be some authority behind it to make it stick, and the task of establishing that authority was assigned to the Armed Forces.

SEEK TO PREVENT NEW WAR

As we proceed with the assigned military task in Korea, your military advisers and planners are keeping these three important factors in mind:

Because we are intent upon preventing world war III, we are not making moves that might lead to an enlargement of the present conflict, whenever it is militarily practicable.

Furthermore, because we seek peace and an end of this war in Korea, our Government is cautious in every decision that might prolong this conflict. I might add that it has been difficult for the men in the field to refrain from attacking the air bases in Manchuria. However, Communist air intervention has not been a factor in the ground ac-

tion to date. Neither has it been any serious threat to our Air Force.

And third, every decision we have recommended has supported United Nations unity in the conduct of war. With these principles in mind, we of the United Nations are now doing an outstanding military job.

Conjecture in military affairs is always risky and often unwarranted, but I would like to give my personal opinion as to some of the accomplishments of the Korean decision that may have escaped public attention. I doubt that even those who supported this move at the time realized how much more was being gained toward world peace.

KREMLIN PLANS DISRUPTED

I believe that our positive action in support of the United Nations resolution was unexpected by the Kremlin-dominated Communists. I think we scored an advantage, and disarranged their plans for Asia.

I think our positive action in support of the United Nations slowed down the plans for world domination, not only in Asia, but in other areas in the world.

The Communist action in Korea indicated to me that the people in the Kremlin were willing to risk world war III. I believe the United Nations action in Korea gave them pause for thought.

I would also estimate that our action in Korea may have prevented, at least temporarily, Chinese Communist aggression toward Indochina. It may have saved Thailand. It may have preserved Formosa. At least it gained time in all of these areas.

There was no doubt in the minds of free-men that we had to draw a line somewhere. Appeasement would have forfeited our chance to stop communism, and encourage them to continue picking off helpless nations one by one. Eventually the international situation would have become intolerable as the Red-dominated areas covered more and more space on the map.

Today, we are carrying out the military operations to enforce this political decision. As we carry out these actions, even though it would possibly result for a time in a military stalemate, we have already achieved an international victory.

PROGRESS TOWARD GOAL

As long as we are able to confine the battles to Korea and continue to destroy the Communist aggressors, we are making progress toward our international objective of preventing world war III. As long as we are keeping Communist forces occupied and off balance and keeping the war confined to Korea, we are minimizing their chances for world domination.

We are going to be faced with some difficult decisions in Korea in the next few months. To solve them we must realize that Korea is not a brief, acute attack of a new disease, it is a symptom of a chronic ailment which must be cured.

In outlining my thoughts on this matter, I have no intention of entering the foreign policy field or even urging a particular policy in the conduct of foreign affairs. Conduct of foreign affairs is a civilian responsibility. But a soldier can often see strategic perils that the layman might overlook. It is fundamental that our foreign policy must be based upon our military capabilities to back it up.

We cannot take the chance of trying to anticipate immediate Communist intentions. We can only determine their capabilities, and prepare to meet them. Otherwise we would be in a guessing game without a referee. We would be playing Russian roulette with a gun at our heads.

PREPARED TO MEET DRIVE

Fundamentally we Americans are apt to become impatient with a situation that has no foreseeable conclusion. We all would like to know when the war in Korea will be over.

I wish that I might tell you: My job would be less difficult if I knew.

If we examine the Communist capabilities in Korea, we find indications that the Chinese Communists are building up for another drive. We must prepare to meet it. There is no assurance that even when this attack is dispelled that the war will be over.

In the case of Korea, those who despair of an early solution are apt to become frustrated and discouraged. There have been recurring and louder whispers in favor of forcing a show-down and delivering an ultimatum to those who encourage such local wars and who continue to obstruct sincere efforts for peaceful negotiation.

Any such direct, unilateral solution to the problem would be militarily infeasible.

I wonder if these responsible citizens have pondered the conditions of such an act? Any ultimatum must state clearly the irreducible minimum of what we would regard as satisfactory and it ordinarily, if not always, implies a threat to use force if the demands are not met. These dissatisfied and impatient strategists—and they are not representing the views of responsible Air Force officials—suggest the threat of bombardment as part of the ultimatum.

BEST CHANCE FOR SURVIVAL

Our policy is to avoid war and to promote peace. Our best chance for the survival of our way of life and our freedom is to continue cooperation in mutual security efforts and to continue negotiation in this worldwide conflict as long as possible. An ultimatum would either commit us to a so-called preventive war, or gain for us only a temporary respite from war until the enemy feels that conditions for his victory were more favorable.

Enlarging the battle to a full-scale war is never an economical or morally acceptable solution to a limited conflict. If at all possible, Korea should be settled on the present battleground.

The confinement or extension of the area of combat is in the realm of diplomacy and international politics. However, the military consideration is an intrinsic part of this problem. Our Armed Forces will continue to carry out the tasks assigned to them until conditions permit a political decision to be reached.

I have mentioned the complexity of the United Nations problems only to encourage us in a steadfast course of patience and preparedness.

UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES PRAISED

The United Nations forces in Korea have done a magnificent job and have exhibited a cooperative spirit that is more effective than any one could have previously imagined.

The Air Force and the Navy have performed wonders in supporting the Ground Forces in Korea. They have exercised ingenuity and imagination in carrying out missions that could not have been anticipated. The Marines have performed heroically side by side with our soldiers.

I am especially proud of the United States Army. The soldiers entered the war in platoon strength, building up to a force of six divisions which have fought through fierce summer heat and bitter winter, usually against great odds, and with platoons and companies, battalions and regiments which were for a long time under strength.

The American people can be very proud of their Armed Forces and of the spirit which these men have shown. If we here at home can only measure up to their standards of sacrifice and devotion—to their achievements in patience and courage—there is every reason to believe that the war in Korea can ultimately be concluded on honorable terms, contributing to a hoped-for permanent peace in our times.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by H. L. Phillips.

Mr. REAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO, Mr. VAN PELT, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. BENDER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks and include editorials.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and in three to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in two instances.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a brief statement.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on two subjects and include editorials in each.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$225.50.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. SCHWABE) was given permission to extend his remarks and to include additional printed matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by the President of the United States.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. LANTAFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri (at the request of Mr. MOULDER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

Mr. MOULDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial by David Lawrence.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Springfield Republican.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER) was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. BEAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a prominent farmer in his district.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. BUSBEY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Folly."

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution passed by the Senate of the State of Illinois.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include letters and one telegram.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. IRVING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOULDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Columbus Daily Tribune.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. WIDNALL), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. HINSHAW, for the balance of today after 5:45 p. m., on account of important medical appointment.

To Mr. COTTON (at the request of Mr. DAGUE), from April 19 to April 24, inclusive, on account of the death of his mother.

To Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. FUGATE), for today, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 60. An act for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova;

S. 82. An act to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941; and

S. 379. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of Labor.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 17, 1951, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1. An act to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

390. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Charles William Fohlinger, file No. A-1117969 CR 25842, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

391. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

392. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Armando Galatolo, file No. A-5243083 CR 25993, and Vincinzeno Maggiore, file No. A-5423568 CR 26068, requesting that they be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

393. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to establish a department of food services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

394. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting Audit Report of Corporations of Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 896. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Raffloer Droesse; with amendment (Rept. No. 330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 961. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Jan Dunkowski, Karolina Dunikowski, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski, and Janina Grospera Dunikowski; with amendment (Rept. No. 331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton; without amendment (Rept. No. 332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Sidney Young Hughes; without amendment (Rept. No. 333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1415. A bill for the relief of Gabriele Gildo Falvo Citrigno; without amendment (Rept. No. 334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Henry Kolish; with amendment (Rept. No. 335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2284. A bill for the relief of Ethel Martha Quinn; with amendment (Rept. No. 336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2807. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Poborski; with amendment (Rept. No. 337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. P. 3141. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Reichardt; without amendment (Rept. No. 338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROSSER:
H. R. 3755. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRYSON:
H. R. 3756. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 2 of the United States Code, entitled "The Congress"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3757. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 20 of the United States Code, entitled "Education"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3758. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food and Drugs"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3759. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 23 of the United States

Code, entitled "Highways"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3760. A bill to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 3761. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3762. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3763. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require that ferryboats and other passenger ships navigating certain bays and sounds shall, unless fitted with radiotelegraph installations, be fitted with radiotelephone installations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3764. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 3765. A bill to provide for overtime compensation for employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3766. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of California for public, religious, educational, recreational, business, residential, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3767. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3768. A bill to repeal provisions of the Social Security Act which require State plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, to restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 3769. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a joint committee to investigate the business methods, operations, rates, and charges of the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to direct the United States Maritime Commission to sell a laid-up Liberty-type vessel from the United States reserve fleet to Panagos Diamanti Pateras, a citizen of Greece; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution to provide that Federal legislation which prohibits the employment of children during certain hours shall not apply with respect to the harvesting of basic agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution to prevent traffic in war materials with our enemies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States should commit itself to certain foreign policies designed to combat the spread of communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to economy in Federal Government expenditures and services; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the use of Chinese Nationalist troops in combat against Chinese Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a national cemetery at Birch Coulee Battlefield in Renville County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation appropriating funds for flood control at Hanapepe, Kauai, authorized by Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, section 10; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3770. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Alfieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3771. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3772. A bill for the relief of Cecil Lennox Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3773. A bill for the relief of Eric Adolf Lenze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3774. A bill for the relief of Dr. David M. Ju; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3775. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando Arturo and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3776. A bill for the relief of Equitable Infants Wear, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3777. A bill for the relief of Stephania Hnatiw and Maria Hnatiw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3778. A bill for the relief of Wong See Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 3779. A bill for the racially ineligible fiancée of a United States citizen veteran of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 3780. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earnest Merl Kersh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

231. By Mr. HINSHAW. Petition of the City Council of the City of Burbank, Calif., petitioning the Congress and the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives to proceed with its proposed investigation of redistricting in the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

232. By Mr. VAN PELT: Petition of Nicholas Meyer, of Madison, Wis., and farmers of Sixth Congressional District protesting changes in the farm parity provisions in the Defense Production Act of 1950 and price ceilings and roll-backs on farm products selling below parity levels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

233. By Mr. SHEEHAN: Memorial of the State of Illinois, Sixty-seventh General Assembly Senate, senate resolution No. 49: "Resolved, by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we express our unqualified confidence in General MacArthur and vigorously condemn the irresponsible and capricious action of the President in summarily discharging him from his command and that we further condemn such action without an opportunity to General MacArthur and others of his command to inform the people of our Nation of the true condition of affairs in Korea and the Far East; and be it further * * *"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

234. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry C. Hallam, secretary, the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C., extending its greetings to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Armed Services.

235. Also, petition of Pedro Gregorio, secretary, Municipality of Plaridel, Province of Bulacan, Republic of the Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expression of gratitude to the generosity of the American people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

236. Also, petition of R. E. Tolentino, secretary, Municipality of Polo, Province of Bulacan, Republic of the Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to approval of legislation for additional war damage appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou kindly Light, as we come groping our way through a maze of life and death, we thank Thee for the durable verities which are above controversy and debate. As on this day we honor a living captain who has fought a good fight and has laid the foundations of freedom in a conquered land, Thou knowest that our welcome home is tinged with grief and sorrow at the passing from this earthly stage of one who with integrity and ability stood for so many years in this Chamber, as he served his State, his Nation, and the world.